



GOVERNOR'S GRIZZLY BEAR ADVISORY COUNCIL

fwp.mt.gov/gbac

Montana Grizzly Bear Advisory Council Working Group Framework Drafts #2 May 11, 2020

At the end of the GBAC April 24th, meeting, Council members requested to remain in their four working groups to continue their review of the consolidated working groups' draft framework document. The focus of this additional working group review was to advance their understanding of the different working group approaches and to begin to synthesize their emerging ideas and draft recommendations.

Each working group's additions and/or responses to the consolidated framework document is combined into this pdf document. Working group 2's draft is first as they took a different approach in pulling out overarching ideas from the consolidated document. Groups 1, 3, and 4 continued to work off of the consolidated document.

Council members reviewed these updated working group documents prior to the May 11th-13th, 2020 meeting.

Group 1 – Bret Barney, Caroline Byrd, Chuck Roady, Kristen Preble Robyn King

Group 2 – Jonathan Bower, Darrin Boss, Kameron Kelsey, Cole Mannix

Group 3 – Lorents Grosfield, Anne Schuschke, Erin Edge, Heath Martinell, Nick Gevock

Group 4 – Greg Schock, Michele Dieterich, Chad Bauer, Trina Jo Bradley

Working Group 2

(How long of a document should we be striving towards? Group 2 believes that concise and to-the-point is desirable.)

Preamble and Principles

Grizzlies are essential to MT and valued by many around the world in addition to being intrinsically valuable. Significant progress toward recovery has occurred since their ESA listing in 1975, and more is needed. Yet, continued progress brings challenges as the human population of Montana increases simultaneously with the populations of grizzly bears. GBAC was charged with providing citizen recommendations for how MT might address these challenges while striving for and maintaining full recovery and eventual delisting. The council recognizes and builds on previous work by the Wolf Advisory Council while recognizing three particular factors distinguishing grizzlies from wolves: Slower reproductive rates, greater adaptability to diverse habitats, and a higher potential danger to humans and their livelihoods. Alongside wilderness and parks, we underscore the essential role of working farms, ranches, and forests, as well as those of the hunting and fishing communities in helping maintain a MT landscape capable of supporting grizzlies. The Grizzly Bear Advisory Council acknowledges the importance of its role in this process as a citizen advisory group and intends to provide meaningful guidance and feedback that will inform but not constrain the management and recovery of grizzly bears into the future.

Vision

We envision fully recovered grizzly populations in the four MT ESA recovery zones and a landscape in between that facilitates physical connectivity. Meanwhile, we recognize that grizzlies may continue to expand outside of the connectivity area. Montana's capacity to accommodate this expansion will be limited in relation to available resources for management, education, infrastructure (e.g. transportation, sanitation), and capacity for supporting ranchers and farmers in prevention, timely conflict response, and mitigation. All those living or visiting in or near the connectivity area should expect to be impacted by the potential presence of grizzly bears, and should be able to access adequate education, assistance and resources to help address these impacts in a timely manner. In Montana, we envision that management decisions continue to be based in sound science that account for local resources, communities, and capacity.

Recommendations

Diversify and increase overall funding.

- Since grizzly bears are a key attribute that drives the region's recreational sector, Montana and other states with grizzly bears should work with the national outdoor recreation industry to join with landowners, sportsmen and women (e.g. via Pittman-Robertson and Dingle Johnson Acts), NGOs and others to increase direct investment in conservation.
- Work with Congress and NPS and USFWS to consider whether funding generated from tourism in national parks could be invested in grizzly conservation.
- Work with NFWF and NRCS on better ways to support working lands in accommodating grizzly impacts.
- Work with the state legislature, agencies and other partners to develop novel funding mechanisms (e.g. Duck stamp, etc.).

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Work with the legislature to bolster personnel for accommodating grizzly presence:

- watershed collaboratives boots (e.g. Eric Graham at Blackfoot Challenge) on the ground
- agency boots on the ground (i.e. bear managers)
- applied research by universities

Strive for close communication and coordination, both among state and federal agency partners, as well as with watershed groups and landowners.

Increase funding for preventative efforts and damage compensation for agricultural operations. As an effective entity that has been set up to serve these functions, the Livestock Loss Board may be a natural fit for this: Specifically,:

- Separate preventative funding from compensation for depredation
- Increase preventative and compensation source of funds
- Increase funding to the fund already established in MAC

Actively invest in overall land health and habitat quality on both public and private lands in MT.

- We look to the work of the state's Forest Action Council for guidance in improving forest management.
- We encourage the state to work with federal agencies to make existing funding sources for private lands (e.g. NRCS) available to more effectively address local needs in Montana.

FWP should continue working with agencies to identify acceptable relocation sites on public lands in the connectivity area in coordination with nearby private landowners, working lands and communities; begin using these sites when appropriate with a priority towards increased genetic diversity.

Previous agreements regarding augmentation and transplanting in recovery zones should be evaluated periodically for their effectiveness and continued if warranted.

Create and maintain a robust statewide Bear Smart education program .

Consolidate state management plans into one updated holistic plan while recognizing the uniqueness of individual areas of the state and the need for situational management.

- Ensure a healthy and sustainable grizzly bear population that also allows for the protection of human safety and rural livelihoods.
- In cooperation with waste management companies, commit major investment to adapt MT's sanitation infrastructure to minimize conflicts.
- Standardize all food storage requirements across state and public lands.
- Enhance education and options for securing attractants on private lands.
- FWP should partner with the Montana Department of Transportation to identify and model potentially important grizzly bear (and other wildlife) crossing points on major highways, and seek funding to incorporate wildlife connectivity into the transportation system as infrastructure upgrades are made.

When and where appropriate, allow for carefully managed hunting.

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

With threats from increasing climate volatility and the impacts it may have on Montana ecosystems and their inhabitants, we urge MT to work with partners to address this major challenge.

Anticipating impacts from more people and more housing, we encourage municipalities, counties, and the state to ensure that land use planning processes are respectful of finite resources, open space, and agricultural lands and encourage the continued use of voluntary conservation easements.

In recognition of the increased grizzly bear population since their 1975 ESA listing and with confidence in management that will lead to recovered populations throughout Montana, the Grizzly Bear Advisory Council recommends the establishment of a date to annually celebrate the landscapes, communities, and continued collaboration in Montana that has allowed for human - grizzly bear coexistence since time immemorial.

Appendix:

A: Public Comments

B: GBAC notes and discussion points.

Working Group 1 Skeletal Framework Draft

Preamble

Frames context, need, and charge for the Council's work.

1. The grizzly bear is our state animal and important to Montana's heritage
2. Most Montanans recognize that grizzly bears are an important part of what makes Montana the "Last Best Place" and Do we need this here? What does the Council say? Group 1 would like to see the results of the social survey before including this.
3. Montana is unique because we have the opportunity to create a connected grizzly bear population
4. Montana is unique in its conservation in the contiguous US.
5. Recognize conservation of bears
6. Humans and bears have shared the landscape for thousands of years.
7. Recognize the work that has gone into that relationship and the continued effort towards coexistence with grizzly bears
8. Recognize the diversity of cultural perceptions of grizzly bears (include tribal acknowledgement)
9. These are the guiding principles that guide the council recommendations.
 - a. Maintain and enhance human safety
 - b. Ensure a healthy and sustainable grizzly bear population
 - c. Improve timely and effective response to conflicts involving grizzly bears
 - d. Engage all partners in grizzly related outreach and conflict prevention
 - e. Improve intergovernmental, interagency, and tribal coordination

Vision

Articulates desired future state of Montana's relationship with the grizzly bear. (Should use FUTURE TENSE)

10. Recognize the value that grizzly bears bring to the state (tourism, wild nature, ecosystems)
11. Montana has the opportunity to be a leader in the conservation of grizzly bears.
12. Statement addressing where we want bears and why (need further discussion in the whole council regarding the distribution of grizzly bears in MT)
13. Populations of grizzly bears within the federally identified recovery zones are managed by Montana to prevent their reclassification as "threatened" or "endangered" under the ESA. Should vision and recommendations be more generic to either situation (listed or not)? Group 1 thinks this concept needs to be included in the recommendations but not in the vision.
14. Education, outreach and conflict response should be available in all areas where humans and grizzlies share the landscape
15. Grizzly bear/human interactions should be understood from both biological and social science perspectives

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

16. Maintaining secure, remote areas where bears can roam away from populations is essential for the long-term conservation of bears.
17. We envision well-supported and well-funded management, research, and monitoring of grizzly bears. State and federal agencies should support and continue to implement research to promote the long-term conservation of grizzly bears and be at the forefront of providing the best available science.
18. Montana's grizzly bear populations—~~Yellowstone, Northern Continental Divide, Cabinet-Yaak, Selkirk, and eventually the Bitterroot~~ should be thriving, self-sustaining, and interconnected.
19. We support cooperation and continued conservation efforts between state and federal agencies, the public, **Non-governmental organizations** (NGOs), tribal entities, grass roots organizations, and local governments.
20. Facilitate natural movement among recovery zones,
21. We support decision making based on the best available science and current laws
22. Improve outreach and education
23. **Encourage the establishment of** new funding mechanisms for wildlife conservation and management in MT

Recommendations

Provides clear, discreet recommendations (and a way to capture input that doesn't represent a consensus recommendation) based on the direction provided by the Executive Order topics, FWP questions, public input, existing research/publications, and Council discussion.

Grizzly Bear Distribution

24. MTFWP in consultation with relevant agencies and the public should develop a statewide management plan for grizzly bear conservation and management. The plan should address:
 - a. Biologically suitable and socially acceptable habitat
 - b. Biologically suitable has been defined in recovery zones, the whole state could possibly be "biologically suitable"
 - c. Social tolerance is subjective
 - d. Connectivity should be accounted for in biologically suitable
 - e. incorporates open space, connectivity and linkage zones
 - f. Incorporate assessment of human activities and impacts in conservation areas
 - g. Identify acceptable range and linkage zones
 - h. **Identify and** address unique challenges.
 - i. considers the entire state as a connected habitat
25. Grizzly bears should be managed to meet the recovery population goals within the existing recovery areas
26. Provide opportunities to move between these areas in connectivity zones (Areas 1-3¹)

1

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

27. Encourage habitat restoration and enhancement on public and private lands
28. Allow natural movement including to new areas, protect habitat, protect local communities (not sure what protect local communities means...can we change this to enable & prepare communities to co-exist with grizzly bears and reduce conflicts with bears)
29. Create re-location/occupation plans (working with appropriate communities) to establish re-location/occupation areas in Montana
30. Grizzly bear populations should not be augmented by moving bears to previously unoccupied areas. Group 1 is not sure what this means in terms of population augmentation, we'd like further information.
31. Group 2 worked to respond to the questions from FWP related to the critical topics identified by the Governor's executive order. To conceptualize the ideas of distribution, we defined and discussed 4 zones of grizzly bear range and their associated management. (we'd like to have further discussion with group 2 and the whole council)
 - a. Area 1 - Area surrounding Recovery Zones in the NCDE and GYE with strong populations
 - b. Area 2 - Area surrounding Recovery Zones in C-Y and Bitterroot Selway lacking strong populations
 - c. Area 3 - Connectivity zone between Areas 1-2 spanning a mix of private and public land
 - d. Area 4 - Lands outside of Areas 1-3 which do not provide connection to established Recovery Zones
32. Bears should be managed within and between the four designated recovery ecosystems within Montana. Manage for habitat and population growth in Area 1, manage for conflict prevention and sustained populations in Areas 2-3, manage for conflict prevention and response in Area 4 same as above
33. Plan should include a detailed and comprehensive outreach and education component to address social tolerance and acceptance¹
34. Review and update the 1993 recovery plan (not sure if this belongs or not) Group 1 thinks the 1993 recovery plan should be reviewed.
35. The recovery areas (this cannot be done by us) and outside zones of each ecosystem should be removed and Montana should be designated as one grizzly bear habitat keeping in mind that biologically suitable does not mean socially acceptable or appropriate. (this is a council conversation) (We need to discuss the difference between one management plan and one population - group 1 agrees)
36. Management protocols should include flexibility
37. Encourage habitat restoration and enhancement on public and private lands

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

38. Encourage and support research and monitoring around food resources, habitat, road densities and other identified research needs related to habitat security, in areas of current and future grizzly bear occupancy.

Connectivity (much of this is redundant and can be consolidated)

39. Connectivity is vital to the long term sustainability, persistence, and resiliency of grizzly bears in the lower 48. (Montana has the opportunity to be a leader in conservation of the grizzly bear.)
- a. Strive for ~~occupied habitat~~ habitat connectivity between recovery zones
 - b. Protect habitat to allow for natural migration (should be movement instead of migration)
 - i. Conservation easements
 - ii. No hunting of grizzly bears allowed in connectivity zones
 - iii. Evaluate federal land use planning processes and projects for impact to habitat requirements for natural connectivity with focus on food storage and road management
 - iv. Bears in connectivity zones will not be translocated back to recovery areas (need to develop areas in DMA outside PCA that are tolerable relocation zones)
 - v. Discourage Restrict new residential development to allow for wildlife movement near public lands. Clustering with wildlife corridors. Attractant restrictions
40. The likely connectivity zones exist in diverse social and environmental settings - not all of these settings are conducive to permanent habitation, but should be managed to promote genetic connectivity.
41. FWP define connectivity zones within Montana where natural/functional connectivity (i.e. occupancy, ecological function in connective areas) is proactively encouraged through:
- i. Management decisions take connectivity into consideration
 - ii. Increase monitoring of bear movements between recovery zone users to reduce conflicts spatially/temporally real-time and improve communication between ~~locals~~ affected communities and individuals (we weren't sure what "locals" meant, is locals too broad?) and government agencies
 - iii. Need to develop relocation areas in between recovery zones
 - iv. Improve communication and work with local communities to discuss tolerable relocation areas.
42. Work with MDT and Federal Highways and Trains (Federal Railroad Administration) to reduce transportation mortalities and facilitate movement and enhance public safety

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

- i. Enhance understanding of priority areas; include wildlife migration and movement corridors into infrastructure improvement plans 2
- ii. Identify, model and develop potentially important grizzly bear crossing points on major highways and seek funding and planning opportunities to incorporate wildlife crossing practices into the transportation system
- iii. Protecting and identifying these areas will provide more areas of colonization to relocate bears and encourage natural migration movement and connectivity between recovery areas. Private lands in between the areas should be considered for conservation easements.
- b. Work with partners on a wildlife transportation safety campaign
- c. Work with appropriate entities to explore ways to minimize train/bear collisions due to grain spills and carcasses near train tracks.
 - 1. Think tanks for solving problems in high mortality situations
 - 2. Suggested reduced speed limits at night
- d. Private lands and identified areas should be included in the conversation and considered for conservation easements
 - i. Protect habitat in connectivity zones
 - 1. Road building restrictions similar to Amendment 19
 - 2. Recommend Wilderness designation for WSAs
 - 3. Honor strict protections of IRAs

Moving Bears

- 43. All agencies should work together to develop a protocol for translocating bears a) between ecosystems, b) within an ecosystem, c) outside of a designated ecosystem, which further the conservation, connection and recovery of grizzly bears in the state of Montana. Bears translocated due to previous conflict may need to be placed deeper into core habitat of a designated ecosystem.
- 44. Previous agreements regarding augmentation and transplanting in recovery zones should continue to be honored
- 45. USFWS, FWP USFS and WS need to work together with local landowners, local watershed groups and county governments to identify new relocation sites outside of the designated management areas, especially in connectivity zones.
- 46. Human assisted movement of bears may be a strategy when needed, for example, to rescue a subpopulation.
- 47. Male bears should be relocated to new areas to promote genetic dispersal (does the one above say the same thing as this?)
- 48. Bears should not be moved back to the population they came from. They should be moved to predesignated sites within Areas 1 and 2 or public land anchors of Area 3 with priority to areas that have not met recovery goals
- 49. Agencies should use habitat research to establish suitable re-location sites in Montana.
- 50. If bears are already in or near unoccupied areas, allow for flexibility and allow moving bears to the nearest remote habitat rather than returned to recovery areas (are these

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

getting at the same message of the need to identify relocation areas in between zones?
If so, can these be combined?) **yes**

51. Decisions related to food conditioned, habituated, or known conflict bears should be given extra consideration and more flexible management opportunities
52. Clarification is needed when communicating with the public about Transplant Protocols and the difference between re-locating a bear that moved in on its own vs. reintroduction/augmentation

Conflict Prevention

53. Continue to support, fund and encourage carcass removal programs.
54. Create consistent food storage requirements across state and federal lands and encourage the same standards on private lands.
 - a. reach out to outfitters - MT Board of Outfitters¹
55. Land managers provide bear resistant/conflict reducing infrastructure in areas of potential conflict on public lands
56. There should be a prioritization of conflict prevention regulations that help to prevent conflict within and nearby Areas (see explanation of areas by group 2)
 - a. Statewide regulations for public land use (**what does this mean? Could create misunderstanding if it's too broad**)
 - b. Sanitation/waste recommendations for municipalities/private land
 - c. On public lands, phase in regulations with opportunity for public response and "buy in"
 - d. Recommendation that state encourages federal agencies to consolidate bear related information, outreach, and regulations within Montana
 - i. Multi-agency cooperation and consistency
57. Human prevention
 - a. Create an additional conflict prevention grant program, not coupled with the Livestock Loss Board, to address conflicts and losses.
 - b. One idea would be to reassess the Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks Living with Wildlife grant program.
 - c. Work with planning boards to proactively recommend actions to governing bodies on how to minimize bear conflicts
 - d. Public (hunters recreationists, anglers, hikers etc
 1. Foraging and recreation should be seasonally limited in areas with high grizzly concentrations. Trails and other public areas should be subject to closures when necessary
 - e. Farms and Ranches
 1. MTFWP **and Wildlife Services** should put more time and resources into conflict prevention, and should focus on the safety of those people that must work on the landscape raising livestock and crops.

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

2. Encourage a consistent messaging system between bear managers, residents and livestock producers. This would also encourage neighborhood watch systems
3. Encourage livestock conflict prevention measures
- f. Reduce public and state land conflicts
 1. Encourage carrying accessible bear spray in bear country
 2. New trails should not be constructed in core grizzly habitat
 3. Front country campgrounds, picnic areas, and other areas utilized for vehicle or bicycle camping should have bear resistant food and attractant storage facilities. Bear resistant infrastructure should be available at all federal and local campgrounds and other public areas.
 4. Encourage livestock producers to to implement appropriate conflict prevention on public lands (need more clarification on this)
- g. Reduce Hunter Conflicts
 1. Increase education of hunting safely in bear country
 2. Encourage outfitters to provide bear spray and training to clients
 3. Encourage carrying bear spray when hunting
- h. Montana needs to invest in more outreach in all zones across the state.
 1. Recommend that outreach is enhanced and that FWP look to prioritize conflict response when creating / funding new positions. Look to cost-share models that currently exist (e.g. Eric Graham, Blackfoot Challenge).
 2. Recommend that FWP prioritize cost share/ liaison positions over direct hires in Areas 3 and 4
- i. Continue to support and fully fund necessary bear conservation management personnel so they can continue the outreach and education programs; deal effectively, efficiently and quickly with conflict issues wherever they occur
- j. Establish bear wise community guidelines and protocols. Include an incentive program that encourages Montana communities within bear country to become Bear Wise communities
- k. Encourage governor and Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks to develop a state Bear Aware outreach and education program with a designated bear aware outreach supervisor with the goal to reach all Montanans, tourists, visitors and everyone who enjoys the outdoors, recreates, works and uses the outdoors. Standardize bear spray requirements and protocols to allow everyone to carry bear spray in bear country. (e.g. FedEx, UPS drivers;)
- l. Waste management/sanitation
 1. Support the development of local sanitation ordinances that include enforcement.
 2. Encourage consistency with sanitation recommendations.
 3. Encourage county and local governments to work with local haulers to assess the need to create a bear resistant disposal

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

- option and encourage carriers to modify practices to mitigate bear conflicts. Governor and Federal agencies should pursue funding to support this effort
- 4. Encourage municipal storage orders
 - a. Bear resistant garbage containers
 - b. Waste transfer stations
- m. Support existing carcass removal programs in areas of grizzly bear populations, and implement in areas where necessary and not currently in place
- n. Improve communication and messaging with MT visitors and office of tourism
 - 1. Governor should encourage local communities to embrace bear-wise practices by supporting local grass roots and watershed community groups to work together on becoming bear-wise communities. This should originate in local communities, but state and federal governments can encourage through funding and other support.
- o. Reduce residential conflicts
 - i. Review FWP subdivision recommendations (we'd like to know more about this)
 - ii. Create attractant restrictions
 - iii. Encourage all communities to be Bear Aware
 - iv. Encourage neighborhood communication networks

Group 1 would like this comment included from our original comments:

The state should develop a bear aware/smart tourism and recreation plan that celebrates grizzly bear recovery and addresses conflict zones. Plan should address bear smart and appropriate recreation activities for core habitat and linkage zones.

A tourism/recreation tax should be considered to support bear managers, conflict prevention, and secure habitat.

Conflict Response and Protocols

- 58. ~~Standardize and~~ Clarify management protocols for severe conflict bears (problem bears) and fully fund this part of the conflict prevention program. Continue to use established protocols for bears that continue to engage in severe conflict situations such as food adaptation, unnatural aggressive behavior.... (find legal language)¹
- 59. More conservative response in Area 1 and 2 than Area 3 and 4 (we would like to have more information or agreement on the Areas before answering these questions)
- 60. More liberal/flexible management in Areas 3 and 4 to build trust and acceptance within these communities
- 61. More liberal/flexible management within private lands in Areas 1 and 2 than on public lands in these areas

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

62. State management protocols should be similar state-wide with flexibility case by case, current protocols currently allow for this
- a. Current protocols allow for instant removal in certain cases
 - b. Decisions should prioritize human safety, livelihoods, and common sense.
 - c. Current protocols allow enough flexibility to adapt to changes in distribution
63. Establish clear guidelines for lethal removal of grizzly bears that are consistent with federal regulations and allow for flexibility. The guidelines should be driven by: 1) geography; 2) demographics; 3) evidence of chronic livestock depredation; and 4) conflict severity. Do these last two numbered items say the same thing? Is this one more comprehensive? this is similar to #58. we are fine with #63. These comments seem to be grappling with the tension between clarity and a predictable management response with being too restrictive and proscriptive instead of allowing the bear managers some flexibility in responding to each unique situation.
64. Provide an adequate number of year-round bear management specialists and technicians:
- a. Sufficient, year-round and reliable funding would better allow for transfer of expertise from bear-managers to bear managers in training
 - b. Improve response time
 - c. Allow time for relationship building, outreach, and communication with landowners and livestock producers (for example in linkage zones ahead of bear distribution)
65. Allow landowners to use effective non-lethal methods to haze habituated bears away (For example bear spray cannons that can be used at a distance). (Continue to work with and acknowledge the Secretaries of DOI and USDA for the additional tools for landowners in this area)
- a. Research effective methods to deter and haze bears for public and bear managers
 - b. Educate landowners on safety and use of allowable non-lethal methods to haze bears.

A multiplier is a topic of consideration because...(why a multiplier) meeting discussion April 24

66. Research and explore the possible implementation of a multiplier for livestock and other agricultural losses due to grizzly depredation and damage. Multiplier should have limits pertaining to type of operation, geography, participation in conflict prevention, and personal responsibility.

Role of Hunting

Because we will not reach consensus that hunting has a role in grizzly bear management, this topic should be presented as such and include opposing views and discussion for context and consideration.

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

***In consideration of the spiritual and cultural significance of grizzly bears to the Montana Tribes, sport hunting for grizzly bears should not have a role for bear management. (this should be a numbered item) (RAK)**

- **Hunting as a value based decision, not a requirement of wildlife management (CB)**
- ***There are existing tools that MTFWP has that can be used to accomplish what sport hunting might accomplish. For example, hazing, disbursement tools, removal of problem bears, euthanasia, conflict resolution. (RAK)**

67. Hunting should be considered as a management tool using the best available science to determine limited quota hunts.
68. Given complete recovery and monitoring for sustainable populations in each of the 4 recovery ecosystems consideration should be given to Areas 1 and 4
69. There will be no hunting of any grizzly bear population until endangered species protections are removed
70. Any grizzly bear hunt should be managed by MTFWP to ensure and maintain a healthy grizzly bear population.
71. Messaging to the public should establish that hunting will not replace the need for conflict prevention,
72. Slow/Delayed rollout of hunting after delisting. *Group 1 is divided on whether to leave this in or not, also it is included in 76.*
73. Consideration of geographic area/importance to connectivity.
74. FWP implements depredation hunts when necessary. *Group 1 doesn't like this, it's not a fair chase hunt and is full of potential problems. FWP should be managing problem bears outside of hunting.*
75. Strict enforcement of poaching is necessary for the long-term conservation of bears and stringent fines and enforcement should continue regardless of listing. Consider increasing poaching fines *and include other punishments such as loss of hunting privileges for a significant time.*
76. *If a hunt is allowed, it should be delayed for a few years after de-listing, hunting should be extremely limited in scope, should not allow hunting near the parks, should not allow hunting in vital linkage habitat, and should be easily suspended or cancelled during high mortality years. Group 1 agrees with this statement overall and thinks that it sums up our position on hunting well (except for Robyn), but has concerns that a "delay" would cause concerns about flexible timelines and moving goal posts.*
77. USFWS, MTFWP and USDA Wildlife Services should work together to use their expertise, best available science, and experience to establish a hunting season or seasons in Montana that will both maintain and help control the population.

May 11, 2020
Working Group 1
Draft Hunting Framework

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

The decision whether to hunt grizzly bears in Montana should not be and does not need to be made immediately. Montana's decision to hold off on a hunt after the Yellowstone population was initially delisted was wise and set the stage for continuing to make measured and thoughtful decisions around hunting grizzlies. However, the Grizzly Bear Advisory Council (GBAC) should discuss and consider all aspects of the issues and values surrounding hunting grizzly bears in Montana and should make recommendations concerning hunting to the Governor as part of the GBAC charter.

Values to consider:

- Tribal Interests/cultural values among different tribes
- Hunters' Interests:
 - Recreational Hunting
 - Trophy hunting
- Anti-hunting Interests
- Montanans' attitudes
- Wildlife management and the role of hunting
- Allowing for population connectivity and natural expansion
- Good Decision making rooted in facts with clearly stated objectives and guided by best-available science

Factors to consider:

- Hunting hasn't been proven to reduce conflicts
- Hunting **may** increase social tolerance
- Hunting can be done in a way that maintains a stable population, if hunting only occurs in areas where there is an accurate population estimate
- Hunting cannot occur unless bears are delisted throughout MT
- Hunting can be done in a way that is not detrimental to long-term conservation goals for connected populations if hunting is not allowed in areas critical for connectivity
- Addressing conflicts, including removing bears, is an alternative to hunting for managing distribution
- Hunting as a value based decision, not a requirement of wildlife management
- MT FWP's proposed hunting framework will not generate substantive revenue
- Suitable habitat and conflict will drive grizzly bear distribution and occupancy in MT.

Potential Objectives:

- Maintain a stable, not decreasing, population
- Meet demographic goals (connectivity)
- Allow for recreational hunting opportunity
- Increase social tolerance (need to know if hunting does increase social tolerance, and how broadly)
- Provide hunter harvest data for research purposes
- Benefits of not hunting considered on equal footing with hunting

Education

78. Create volunteer education positions similar to hunter education

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

79. Develop K-12 curriculum guides for teachers to implement grizzly education into learning objectives
 - a. Cross-curriculum activities
 - b. Include the best available science, bear biology, and conflict prevention strategies should be created and implemented
 - c. Include games and activities that appeal to all learning styles.
80. Expand and improve bear safety information to all outdoor user groups
 - a. Develop a recreating in bear country educational video
 - b. Encourage and educate about the use of bear spray
81. Create a bear education coordinator position within FWP
 - a. Use the best available science, bear biology and conflict prevention strategies to streamline and create a catalog of all education, handouts, etc that exist 3
 - b. Bear-Wise Communities whatever term we use should be standardized throughout the state and perhaps coordinated with Wyoming and Idaho.
 - c. Coordinate Include with tourism, realtors, VRBOs, chambers of commerce, outdoor businesses, etc in educational programs.
 - d. Fund a FWP grizzly PR person to boost funding for conflict prevention and conservation. (is this different than #81?)
 - e. Address outreach and education needs on public lands with rapidly increasing use
 - f. improve bear safety information and outreach to new residents and visitors. Make the Kalispell Airport bear spray program a state-wide effort.
82. A coexistence and education Summit or Academy should take place regularly (at least annually) so that people can brainstorm and discuss new challenges and ways to address them
 - a. create consistent messaging, reporting, and to share effective strategies
83. ~~Mandatory~~ bear awareness training for recreationists on public and state lands. This could be encouraged by offering incentives like discounts at REI, Cabelas or bear spray etc
84. Hunter Education
 - a. Create a video of bear safety lecture for hunters, anglers, hunters education classes, outfitters, residents and non-residents
 - b. Require an annual online test for residents and non-residents on bear identification and couple this with a bear spray proper use video
 - c. Incorporate grizzly bear education in all hunter education programs. Train all hunter education trainers to be bear safety instructors.
85. Require commercial foragers watch a bear safety video and take a bear safety test each year with their public land permits/licenses like hunters and anglers

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

86. Look into occupational safety and health safety standards for businesses (outfitters, state employees, recreational tours, etc.) for requiring bear safety standards (see #57 k - it includes FedEx and UPS drivers - they were not allowed to carry bear spray)

Communication among agencies and between agencies and the public

87. Identify gaps in intergovernmental, interagency, and tribal coordination and create an action plan to address the gaps and improve the communication and coordination.
Improve the consultation process between USFWS and USFS during the NEPA process.
88. FWP needs to better communicate with the public, especially with landowners and livestock producers, when it comes to trapping and relocating grizzlies for any reason.
89. Establish consistent messaging
90. Work with relevant agencies to create a streamlined way for reliable public reporting of possible grizzly bear sightings
91. Establish cooperative monitoring programs on public lands to assess impacts of increased recreation on wildlife into the future.
92. Establish cooperative monitoring programs – FWP, USFS, Permittees, NGOs on public land grazing allotments as applicable and available.
93. The state should develop a bear aware/smart tourism and recreation plan that celebrates grizzly bear recovery and addresses conflict zones. Plan should address bear smart and appropriate recreation activities for core habitat and linkage zones.
94. Review interagency MOUs for opportunities to improve efficiency and capacity for conflict response. (we'd like more explanation of this). Should this be in conflict response or interagency communication?

Resources:

WHY: (Do we need a section or list of where the funding should go? or should it be included in the pertinent section of the document.)

95. Increase partnership, funding and support for local watershed groups and other organizations to help (for example):
- a. Support local conflict mitigation efforts
 - b. expand outreach efforts
 - c. Provide salary cost shares with local groups
96. Support rural economies and private lands
97. Consider the implication de-listing may have on future funding.
98. Look for long term funding for the livestock loss board
99. Separate compensation for depredation from funding for conflict response so each can be adequately funded.
100. Support funding for conservation easements

IDEAS FOR GETTING FUNDING

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

101. Encourage state to pursue any and all options for increased funding opportunities (federal, state and private funding sources)
102. Wyoming Resolution and other tools Wyoming is using to fund wildlife management (see 116)
103. Salary cost shares
104. Community Grants
105. Establish a dedicated permanent fund including state and national partners for grizzly conservation. This permanent Grizzly Fund would pay for management and preventative measures for human and bear co-existence in the United States. Seed money from federal appropriations would start this fund
106. Establish a permanent fund for non-lethal grizzly conservation that could be seeded with a farm bill appropriation and enhanced with national public contributions.
107. Duck stamp model
108. Resort/gas/tourism/recreation tax and fees
109. AIS prevention pass model
110. Montana recreation license
111. Revive the Living with Wildlife Grant Program
112. Fees on building permits and real estate sales to preserve open spaces
113. Recreation license with low costs (1-2 dollars) for in-state recreationists (For example this exists for DNRC lands)
114. Review CSKT and Blackfeet conservation permits for ideas
115. Look at the Montana Sage Grouse Initiative and how funding comes through that specific to sage grouse habitat
116. Conservation fee associated with national parks
117. Recovering America's Wildlife Act
118. Farm Bill NRCS
 - a. Support efforts to include in the next farm bill, funding for grizzly conservation/conflict mitigation efforts.
119. Wildlife Conservation Stamp
120. Establish partnerships with insurance companies for wildlife friendly transportation infrastructure (for example - Colorado)
121. Contribute to bear conflict management funding through a mandatory additional fee added to bear (black or grizzly) hunting license
122. Grizzly Bear Advisory Council license plate and other GBAC shwag to support grizzly bear management

Other

123. Celebrate Grizzly Day
 - a. Encourage the Governor and the Legislature to designate a day to celebrate grizzly bear conservation, preferably in the spring when bears are waking up
 - b. Bears as part of Montana's heritage to create awareness and remind folks that grizzlies are on the landscape.

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Topics that still need to be discussed as the council as a whole.

- Should we include Exec Order guiding principles in Preamble? yes
- Use of "success" in preamble, needs careful understanding and definition - we think we can avoid using the word "success" and still describe where we are in Montana with the bear's conservation/management status. Is the word "success" even still in the preamble? or have we already taken care of this item?
- what makes Montana unique in its conservation? The degree to which the public has been involved, e.g., the Grizzly Bear Advisory Council. Montana is in a unique position and has an opportunity to connect separate grizzly bear populations in the lower 48.
- Importance of connecting "our" document to the Executive Order [see above](#).
- How do the "whereas" statements from the executive order constrain or inform our work? They set the stage for the work of the GBAC and describe the challenges of managing grizzly bears into the future. Suggest including USDA Wildlife Services as one of the agencies that is involved in managing bears (in #6). Suggest including a "Whereas" that considers the role of private landowners in the future of the bear, with an emphasis on positive incentive based approaches.
- Where do we want bears and why? In Montana because it is important for the future of grizzly bears to have naturally connected populations and for bears to be able to expand into other areas as long as they don't get into trouble. Once they get in trouble, they need to be managed quickly and effectively. We could see bears across the state of Montana, with the caveat that they can establish where there is habitat to support them and the management infrastructure to support them. Let bears do what they do at the same time we need to be careful about augmenting bears in places that don't support them. Let the habitat support the bears. (Bears that are moved to other areas shouldn't be counted as mortalities in the areas they came from.) Let bears move into areas that they're moving into naturally and then manage them to avoid conflicts.
 - Subquestions - within recovery zones, between (connectivity zones), other areas? What is true recovery (metapopulation?)
- What is the continued role of recovery zones? Recovery zones will have an important role until each population in each recovery zone has reached the recovery goals of each recovery plan.
- Is delisting part of the vision? Yes, when recovery has been achieved.
- Is connectivity a part of our vision? Yes
- Do we want a meta-population (we need to make sure everyone understands the definition of meta-population) in Montana, in lower 48? yes
- What is our definition of socially acceptable / tolerant? "Bears are great until they get into trouble" - BB. "I'm all for grizzly bears until they hinder what I want and like to do." - CR. "Where a human population feels comfortable co-existing with bears: Accepting that bears are a part of our landscape and acting accordingly" - RK. "It's a moving target as people learn more about bears, become accustomed to living with bears and understand/accept how they need to modify their behavior to live with bears." - CB

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

- Definitions of "accounting for" and "consider" - what weight are we placing on the actions being discussed? we don't know what this is in reference to.
- Is the whole state "habitat"? Does "habitat" have to be occupied? Yes the whole state is potential habitat but that does not mean that it all needs to be occupied.
- What does defined "habitat" mean for resource allocation? don't know the context of this.
- What do we mean by whole state management, single population? Montana is a huge state with very different landscapes and communities. Management will need to be different for different situations and different places. It is unlikely that we will have one connected single population in MT but we're not sure. We'd like to know more about how this question connects to the idea of a meta-population. We do want a state-wide approach to bears, all bears in the state should be managed, and there should be a state-wide education and outreach effort. Grizzly bears will be managed, studied, monitored, counted, wherever they're found regardless of lines on a map, e.g. Distribution Monitoring Areas of the different recovery zones.
- How do discuss different areas in state - Group 2 as example. Identifying different areas in the state, like Group 2, or the areas outlined on the social survey, could be helpful in establishing clarity around management. We'd like to know what FWP thinks and whether this would be helpful for them.
- Agreed upon definitions for terms - yes, that's important.
- use of create v. encourage v. require etc. Our task is to make recommendations.
- Bear Aware, Bear Smart, Bear Wise terms? What does this mean or look like? Yes, let's clarify so we're using the right term for MT.
- Loss compensation multiplier - Helpful to the livestock producer/landowner to recover some of the costs of having bears on their property and eating their livestock and crops, as well as other expenses that are incurred because of the bear.
should we refrain from the use of the word governor since he will change... be more generic? No - our directive comes from the Governor and we need to complete our task by the deadline.
- What is the difference between one management plan and one habitat or population? Each of these terms has different meanings.

Working Group 3 Skeletal Framework Draft

Preamble

Frames context, need, and charge for the Council's work.

1. The grizzly bear is our state animal and important to Montana's heritage.
2. ~~Most Montanans recognize that grizzly bears are an important part of what makes Montana the "Last Best Place" and~~ Do we need this here? What does the Council say?
Group 3 agrees to Remove
3. Montana is unique ~~in its conservation opportunity to provide for connectivity for grizzly bear populations. because we have the its opportunity to create a connected grizzly bear population~~
4. ~~Montana is unique in its conservation in the contiguous US.~~
5. ~~Recognize conservation of bears~~ Group 3: repetitive of number 3 and 7.
6. ~~Humans and bears have shared the landscape for thousands of years.~~ Group 3: Seems stated below in 7 - may not need
7. Group 3: Recognize the work that has gone into ~~conservation of grizzly bears and that relationship and the continued ongoing~~ effort towards coexistence with grizzly bears
8. Group 3: Recognize grizzly bears hold intrinsic value to people and cultures around the world.
9. Recognize the diversity of ~~cultural~~ American Indian ~~perceptions~~ perspectives of grizzly bears (include tribal acknowledgement)
10. ~~Recognize the value that grizzly bears bring to the state (tourism, wild nature, ecosystems)~~ Group 3 moved from Vision #13
11. Group 3: Recognize the value of working lands to long-term conservation of grizzly bears
12. These are the guiding principles Group 3 set forth by the Governor's Executive Order that guide the counsel recommendations. Group 3 See entire Executive Order in Appendix #
 - a. Maintain and enhance human safety
 - b. Ensure a healthy and sustainable grizzly bear population
 - c. Improve timely and effective response to conflicts involving grizzly bears
 - d. Engage all partners in grizzly related outreach and conflict prevention
 - e. Improve intergovernmental, interagency, and tribal coordination

Vision

Articulates desired future state of Montana's relationship with the grizzly bear. (Should use FUTURE TENSE)

13. ~~Recognize the value that grizzly bears bring to the state (tourism, wild nature, ecosystems)~~ Group 3 felt this fit better in the preamble #10
14. ~~Montana has the opportunity to take the lead in conservation of endangered species like the grizzly bear.~~ Group 3 expressed better in preamble

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

15. ~~Statement addressing where we want bears and why.~~ Group 3: Montana's grizzly bear populations should be healthy and interconnected. Group 3 moved from 21
16. Grizzly bear management /human interactions should be understood from both biological and social science perspectives. Group 3 edited and moved from 19
17. We envision well-supported and well-funded management, conflict response, research, and monitoring of grizzly bears. Group 3 moved from #22
18. Populations of grizzly bears within the federally identified recovery zones are managed by Montana to prevent their reclassification as "threatened" or "endangered" under the ESA. Should vision and recommendations be more generic to either situation (listed or not)? Group 3 agrees to delete this.
19. Improve and expand grizzly bear related education and outreach in Montana. Group 3 suggested edit. and conflict response should be available in all areas where humans and grizzlies share the landscape
20. Grizzly bear/human interactions should be understood from both biological and social science perspectives Group 3 moved up
21. Maintaining secure, remote areas of public land that supports grizzly bears. where bears can roam away from populations is essential for the long term conservation of bears. Group 3 suggested edit
22. We envision well-supported and well-funded management, research, and monitoring of grizzly bears. Group 3 moved to #17 and edited
23. State and federal agencies should support and continue to implement rResearch, management and decision making should be based on the best available science. Group 3 split this off 21, edited and rolled 27 into it
24. Montana's grizzly bear populations—Yellowstone, Northern Continental Divide, Cabinet-Yaak, Selkirk, and eventually the Bitterroot should be thriving, self-sustaining, and interconnected. Group 3: we feel this statement is better at the beginning of our vision statement.
25. We support improved and expanded cooperation, communication and continued conservation efforts between state and federal agencies, the public, NGOs, tribal entities, grass roots organizations, and local governments. Group 3 suggested edits
26. Facilitate natural movement among recovery zones, Group 3: Encompassed elsewhere
27. We support decision making based on the best available science and current laws Group 3 suggests deleting and moving into 23
28. Improve outreach and education Group 3: idea encompassed elsewhere
29. Establish new and adequate funding mechanisms for wildlife grizzly bear conservation and management in Montana. MT Group 3 suggested edit

Commented [1]: This comes back to the Council discussion around the map and the idea of areas

Commented [2]: Important Council discussion

Recommendations

Provides clear, discreet recommendations (and a way to capture input that doesn't represent a consensus recommendation) based on the direction provided by the Executive Order topics, FWP questions, public input, existing research/publications, and Council discussion.

Grizzly Bear Distribution

30. MTFWP in consultation with relevant agencies and the public should develop a statewide management plan for grizzly bear conservation and management. The plan should address:
 - a. Biologically suitable and socially acceptable habitat
 - b. Biologically suitable has been defined in recovery zones, the whole state could possibly be “biologically suitable”
 - c. Social tolerance is subjective
 - d. Connectivity should be accounted for in biologically suitable
 - e. incorporates open space, connectivity and linkage zones
 - f. Incorporate assessment of human activities and impacts in conservation areas
 - g. Identify acceptable range and linkage zones
 - h. address unique challenges.
 - i. considers the entire state as a connected habitat
31. Grizzly bears should be managed to meet the recovery population goals within the existing recovery areas *Group 3 would like to reword this to be more broad or roll into broader vision. Some of us are worried that this statement is a minimum and leaves out areas in-between ecosystems*
32. Provide opportunities to move between these areas in connectivity zones (Areas 1-3²) *We agree with opportunities for movement but need a large discussion on defining these zones. See #45. We like the wording of 45 more and would like to just use 45*
33. Encourage habitat restoration and enhancement on public and private lands
34. Allow natural movement including to new areas, protect habitat, protect local communities
35. Create re-location/occupation areas in Montana *Combine with 26, 28.*
36. ~~Grizzly bear populations should not be augmented by moving bears to previously unoccupied areas.~~ *Group 3 suggest deleting this*
37. Group 2 worked to respond to the questions from FWP related to the critical topics identified by the Governor’s executive order. To conceptualize the ideas of distribution, we defined and discussed 4 zones of grizzly bear range and their associated management.
 - a. Area 1 - Area surrounding Recovery Zones in the NCDE and GYE with strong populations
 - b. Area 2 - Area surrounding Recovery Zones in C-Y and Bitterroot Selway lacking strong populations
 - c. Area 3 - Connectivity zone between Areas 1-2 spanning a mix of private and public land

Commented [3]: Group 3 will come back to number 24

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

d. Area 4 - Lands outside of Areas 1-3 which do not provide connection to established Recovery Zones

38. Bears should be managed within and between the four designated recovery ecosystems within Montana. Manage for habitat and population growth in Area 1, manage for conflict prevention and sustained populations in Areas 2-3, manage for conflict prevention and response in Area 4 **Group 3 would like to come up with a recommendation for MGMT to define these areas.**
39. Plan should include a detailed and comprehensive outreach and education component to address social tolerance and acceptance **Group 3 Suggest move to ED and OUTREACH**
40. Review and update the 1993 recovery plan ~~(not sure if this belongs or not)~~ **Group 3 - remove this**
41. The recovery areas ~~(this cannot be done by us)~~ and outside zones of each ecosystem should be removed and Montana should be designated as one grizzly bear habitat keeping in mind that biologically suitable does not mean ~~socially acceptable or appropriate~~ ~~(this is a council conversation)~~ ~~(We need to discuss the difference between one management plan and one population)~~ **Group 3 would like to remove this. Better stated elsewhere.**
42. Management protocols ***do and should continue to** ~~should~~ include flexibility
43. Encourage habitat restoration and enhancement on public and private lands **Repeat of number 27**
44. Encourage and support research and monitoring around food resources, habitat, road densities and other identified research needs related to habitat security, in areas of current and future grizzly bear occupancy.

Commented [4]: This should be a large group discussion and we feel the MGMT agencies should define the zone

Connectivity

45. Connectivity is vital to the long term sustainability, persistence, and resiliency of grizzly bears in the lower 48. ~~(Montana has the opportunity to take the lead in conservation of the grizzly bear.)~~
 - a. ~~Strive for occupied habitat between recovery zones~~
 - b. ~~Protect habitat to allow for natural migration~~
 - i. ~~Conservation easements~~
 - ii. ~~No hunting of grizzly bears allowed in connectivity zones~~
 - iii. ~~Evaluate federal land use planning processes and projects for impact to habitat requirements for natural connectivity with focus on food storage and road management~~
 - iv. ~~Bears in connectivity zones will not be translocated back to recovery areas (need to develop areas in DMA outside PCA that are tolerable relocation zones)~~
 - v. ~~Restrict new residential development to allow for wildlife movement near public lands. Clustering with wildlife corridor. Attractant restrictions~~

Commented [5]: Group 3 feels this (39) could be part of our vision statement and 40 and below will be how we do that.

Commented [6R5]: Roll-in social context to this. We need connectivity BUT we need to acknowledge and support the locals who will be living with these bears.

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

46. ~~The likely connectivity zones exist in diverse social and environmental settings—not all of these settings are conducive to permanent habitation, but should be managed to promote genetic connectivity.~~ Group 3: As long as we address social needs later, which we do in 41
47. FWP define connectivity zones within Montana where natural/functional connectivity (i.e. occupancy, ecological function in connective areas) is proactively encouraged through:
- Management decisions take connectivity into consideration
 - Increase monitoring of bear movements between recovery zone users to reduce conflicts spatially/temporally real-time and improve communication between locals and agencies
 - Need to develop relocation areas in between recovery zones
 - Improve communication and work with local communities to discuss ~~tolerable~~ Group 3: suitable relocation areas.
48. Work with MDT and Federal Highways and Trains to reduce transportation mortalities and facilitate movement and enhance public safety
- ~~Enhance understanding of priority areas; include wildlife migration corridors into infrastructure improvement plans~~ Group 3 would like to strike this. Stated below.
 - Identify, model and develop potentially important grizzly bear crossing points on major highways and seek funding and planning opportunities to incorporate wildlife crossing practices into the transportation system
 - ~~Protecting and identifying these areas will provide more areas of colonization to relocate bears and encourage natural migration movement and connectivity between recovery areas.~~ Private lands in between the areas should be considered for conservation easements.
- b. Work with partners on a wildlife transportation safety campaign
- c. Work with appropriate entities to explore ways to minimize train/bear collisions due to grain spills and carcasses near train tracks.
- ~~Think tanks for solving problems in high mortality situations~~
 - ~~Suggested **seasonal** reduced speed limits at night~~ Group 3. Redundancy.
- d. ~~Private lands and identified areas should be included in the conversation and considered for conservation easements~~
- ~~Protect habitat in connectivity zones~~
 - ~~Road building restrictions similar to Amendment 19~~
 - ~~Recommend Wilderness designation for WSAs~~
 - ~~Honor strict protections of IRAs~~ Group 3 would like to remove due to repeat of 42iii

Moving Bears

49. All agencies should work together to develop a protocol for translocating bears a) between ecosystems, b) within an ecosystem, c) outside of a designated ecosystem, which further the conservation, connection and recovery of grizzly bears in the state of Montana. ~~Bears translocated due to previous conflict may need to be placed deeper into core habitat of a designated ecosystem.~~ **Group 3 would like to remove. Bear managers will know the best place to move a bear.**
50. Previous agreements regarding augmentation and transplanting in recovery zones should continue to be honored.
51. USFWS, FWP USFS and WS need to work together with local landowners, local watershed groups and county governments to identify new relocation sites outside of the designated management areas, especially in connectivity zones. **Group 3 - this is also in 26,28,29. Do we want one spot or two. We feel this is a better statement.**
52. Human assisted movement of bears may be a strategy when needed, for example, to rescue a subpopulation.
53. ~~Male bears should be relocated to new areas to promote genetic dispersal (does the one above say the same thing as this?)~~ **Group 3 would like to remove. Repeated idea from the 30's**
54. ~~Bears should not be moved back to the population they came from. They should be moved to pre-designated sites within Areas 1 and 2 or public land anchors of Area 3 with priority to areas that have not met recovery goals~~
55. ~~Agencies should use habitat research to establish suitable re-location sites in Montana.~~
56. ~~If bears are already in or near unoccupied areas, allow for flexibility and allow moving bears to the nearest remote habitat rather than returned to recovery areas (are these getting at the same message of the need to identify relocation areas in between zones? If so, can these be combined?)~~ **Group 3 - we feel this is repetitive from distribution and connectivity. See 45**
57. ~~Decisions related to food conditioned, habituated, or known conflict bears should be given extra consideration and more flexible management opportunities~~ **Group 3 feels this is too restrictive. And we cover it earlier by supporting MGMT flexibility.**
58. Clarification is needed when communicating with the public about * **no capital T** or PTransplant Protocols and the difference between re-locating a bear that moved in on its own vs. reintroduction/augmentation

Commented [7]: Example - CYaak

Conflict Prevention

59. Continue to support, fund and encourage carcass removal programs.
60. Create consistent food storage requirements across state and federal lands and encourage the same standards on private lands.
 - a. ~~reach out to outfitters — MT Board of Outfitters~~ **Group 3 feels outfitters are already doing this and don't need to be singled out[±]**
61. Land managers provide bear resistant/conflict reducing infrastructure in areas of potential conflict on public lands

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

62. There should be a prioritization of conflict prevention regulations that help to prevent conflict within and nearby Areas (see explanation of areas by group 2)

- a. ~~Statewide regulations for public land use~~
- b. ~~Sanitation/waste recommendations for municipalities/private land~~
- c. ~~On public lands, phase in regulations with opportunity for public response and “buy in”~~
- d. ~~Recommendation that state encourages federal agencies to consolidate bear related information, outreach, and regulations within Montana~~
 - i. ~~Multi-agency cooperation and consistency~~ Group 3 thinks this is better expressed in other parts of document

63. Human prevention

- a. Create an additional conflict prevention grant program, not coupled with the Livestock Loss Board, **to address livestock and non-livestock related conflicts and losses. Group 3: suggested addition to this**
- b. ~~One idea would be to~~ Reassess the Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks Living with Wildlife grant program. **Group 3 is ok with deleting this but if we keep as an idea to describe the program briefly**
- c. ***MTFWP** Work with planning boards to proactively recommend actions to governing bodies on how to minimize bear conflicts
- d. Public (hunters recreationists, anglers, hikers etc)
 - 1. Foraging and recreation should be seasonally limited in areas with high grizzly concentrations. Trails and other public areas should be subject to closures when necessary ***for human safety/bear safety**
- e. Farms and Ranches
 - 1. ~~MTFWP should put more time and resources into conflict prevention, and should focus on the safety of those people that must work on the landscape raising livestock and crops.~~
 - 2. Encourage a consistent messaging system between bear managers, residents and livestock producers. This would also encourage neighborhood watch systems
 - 3. **Encourage Support** livestock conflict prevention measures **on private land**
- f. Reduce public and state land conflicts
 - 1. Encourage carrying accessible bear spray in bear country
 - 2. New trails should not be constructed in core grizzly habitat
 - 3. ~~Front country campgrounds, picnic areas, and other areas utilized for vehicle or bicycle camping should have bear resistant food and attractant storage facilities. Bear resistant infrastructure should be available at all federal and local campgrounds and other public areas.~~ **Group 3: repetitive see 55**
 - 4. Encourage **Support** livestock producers to to implement appropriate conflict prevention **measures** on public land **allotments**
- g. **Reduce Hunter Conflicts**
 - 1. ~~Increase education of hunting safely in bear country~~

Commented [8]: Lets remove 'human prevention' as a heading and have each letter bullet (a, b, c...) pulled out as a number.

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

2. Encourage outfitters to provide bear spray and training to clients
3. Encourage ~~*all hunters~~ carrying bear spray when hunting
- h. Montana needs to invest in more outreach in all zones across the state.
 1. Recommend that outreach is enhanced and that FWP look to prioritize conflict response when creating / funding new positions. Look to cost share models that currently exist (e.g. Eric Graham, Blackfoot Challenge).
 2. Recommend that FWP prioritize cost share/ liaison positions over direct hires in Areas 3 and 4.
- i. Continue to support and fully fund necessary bear conservation management personnel so they can continue the outreach and education programs; deal effectively, efficiently and quickly with conflict issues wherever they occur
- j. Establish bear ~~Aware~~wise community guidelines and protocols. Include an incentive program that encourages Montana communities within bear country to become Bear ~~Aware~~Wise communities
- k. Encourage governor and Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks to develop a state Bear Aware outreach and education program with a designated bear aware outreach supervisor with the goal to reach all Montanans, tourists, visitors and everyone who enjoys the outdoors, recreates, works and uses the outdoors. Standardize bear spray requirements and protocols to allow everyone to carry bear spray in bear country. (e.g. FedEx, UPS drivers.) ~~Group 3: this is stated in 82~~
- l. Waste management/sanitation
 1. Support the development of local sanitation ordinances that ~~Group 3:~~ require garbage be stored in a bear-resistant manner and include identification of entities for enforcement.
 2. Encourage consistency with sanitation recommendations.
 3. Encourage county and local governments to work with local haulers to assess the need to create a bear resistant disposal option and encourage carriers to modify practices to mitigate bear conflicts. Governor and Federal agencies should pursue funding to support this effort ~~Group 3: Combine 1 and 3~~
 4. Encourage municipal storage orders
 - a. Bear resistant garbage containers
 - b. Waste transfer stations ~~Group 3: Deleting Repetitive~~
- m. Support existing carcass removal programs in areas of grizzly bear populations, and implement in areas where necessary and not currently in place
- n. Improve communication and messaging with MT visitors and office of tourism ~~Group 3 recommends deleting - this is said in 82 outreach and education~~
 1. Governor should encourage local communities to embrace bear wise practices by supporting local grass roots and watershed community groups to work together on becoming bear wise communities. This should originate in local communities, but state and federal governments can encourage through funding and other support. ~~Group 3 recommends deleting - repeat below in Education Outreach~~

Commented [9]: Combine and move to outreach and education

Commented [10]: See 64, worded well there.

Commented [11]: Stated in 64 and other areas. redundant here.

Commented [12]: discuss bear wise wordsmith

Commented [13R12]: Should we ask FWP what they would prefer us to use and how do they define it.

Commented [14R12]: Group 3 agrees to let FWP determine the best terminology

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

- o. Reduce residential conflicts
 - i. Review FWP subdivision [recommendations](#) for updates to Human Bear Conflicts-Appendix C-4 Group 3
 - ii. ~~Create attractant restrictions~~ Group 3 suggests deleting - would need some rewording to include and should be included without “restrictions” needed in Bear Aware communities (thinking outside of the sanitation requirements already included above)
 - iii. Encourage all communities to be Bear Aware
 - iv. Encourage neighborhood communication networks to pair with local bear managers - similar to Jamie Jonkel in R2.

Commented [15]: Check with FWP about what we should call this

Conflict Response and Protocols

- 64. ~~Standardize and~~ Group 3 edit: Clarify management protocols for ~~severe~~ conflict bears. Explaining this process should be a component of a comprehensive outreach program. Anne feels this would promote social tolerance from both sides on why decisions are made around bears. (problem bears) and fully fund this part of the conflict prevention program. Continue to use established protocols for bears that continue to engage in severe conflict situations such as food adaptation, unnatural aggressive behavior.... (find legal language) Group 3: recommends deleting a large portion of this. We agree there is a need for clarification but this feels like it is not in line with the need for flexibility in specific situations
- 65. More conservative response in Area 1 and 2 than Area 3 and 4
- 66. More liberal/flexible management in Areas 3 and 4 to build trust and acceptance within these communities
- 67. More liberal/flexible management within private lands in Areas 1 and 2 than on public lands in these areas
- 68. State management protocols should be similar state wide with flexibility case by case, current protocols currently allow for this
 - a. Current protocols allow for instant removal in certain cases
 - b. Decisions should prioritize human safety, livelihoods, and common sense.
 - c. Current protocols allow enough flexibility to adapt to changes in distribution
- 69. Establish clear guidelines for lethal removal of grizzly bears that are consistent with federal regulations and allow for flexibility. The guidelines should be driven by: 1) geography; 2) demographics; 3) evidence of chronic livestock depredation; and 4) conflict severity Do these last two numbered items say the same thing? Is this one more comprehensive? Group 3: Agrees to delete 62. Clarify with FWP that these guidelines are already in place. Is this a communication issue about what guidelines exist (see our edits to 58)? Or is there a need to include something like this -Council and FWP discussion. We might want to delete or edit this in response to that discussion.

Commented [16]: The discussions on areas are a discussion for the council and Group 3 feels these areas would need to be identified by the management agencies as part of the plan revision process and undergo additional public comment

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

70. Provide an adequate number of year-round bear management specialists and technicians. **Group 3: Recognizing that overtime additional bear managers and technicians will likely be needed:**
- a. Sufficient, year-round and reliable funding would better allow for transfer of expertise from bear-managers to bear managers in training
 - b. Improve response time
 - c. Allow time for relationship building, outreach, and communication with landowners and livestock producers **Group 3: and local communities** (for example in linkage zones ahead of bear distribution)
71. Allow landowners to use effective non-lethal methods to haze habituated bears away. **Group 3 suggestion-not needed:** ~~(For example bear spray cannons that can be used at a distance).~~
- a. Research effective methods to deter and haze bears for public and bear managers.
 - b. Educate **Group 3: landowners local communities** on safety and use of allowable non-lethal methods to haze bears.

72. Multiplier

~~A multiplier is a topic of consideration because...(why a multiplier) meeting discussion April 24~~
Group 3 suggests deleting writing team note

- a. Research and explore the possible implementation of a multiplier for livestock loss due to grizzly depredation. **A multiplier should have limits pertaining to type of operation, geography, participation in conflict prevention, and personal responsibility. Group 3: This needs additional Council discussion - particularly around geography and type of operation. Using the words "Research and Explore" allows/recognizes this discussion will be ongoing outside of the Council**

Role of Hunting

73. Hunting should be considered as a management tool using the best available science to determine limited quota hunts. **Group 3: This is a council discussion. Note the word "should"**
74. ~~Given complete recovery and monitoring for sustainable populations in each of the 4 recovery ecosystems consideration should be given to Areas 1 and 4~~
Group 3: Suggests deleting-confusing.
75. There will be no hunting of any grizzly bear population until endangered species protections are removed
76. Any grizzly bear hunt should be managed by MTFWP to ensure and maintain a healthy grizzly bear population.
77. Messaging to the public should establish that hunting will not replace the need for conflict prevention
78. **Group 3 suggestion: If hunting occurs after delisting, roll out should be slow and possibly delayed. Slow/Delayed rollout of hunting after delisting.**
79. **Group 3: A hunting structure/quotas should take into consideration of the geographic area and importance to connectivity.**

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

80. FWP implements depredation hunts when necessary. **Group 3: Council Discussion. What is the intended definition of “depredation hunt”? Is this talking about targeting specific depredating bears.**
81. Strict enforcement of poaching is necessary for the long-term conservation of bears and stringent fines and enforcement should continue regardless of listing. Consider increasing poaching fines.
82. ~~If a hunt is allowed, it should be delayed for a few years after de-listing, should be extremely limited in scope, should not allow hunting near the parks, should not allow hunting in vital linkage habitat, and should be easily suspended or cancelled during high mortality years.~~ **Group 3 suggest deleting - repetitive**
83. ~~USFWS, MTFWP and USDA Wildlife Services should work together to use their expertise, best available science, and experience to establish a hunting season or seasons in Montana that will both maintain and help control the population.~~ **Group 3: Suggest deleting repetitive**
84. **Group 3 addition: Regulations must recognize the importance of females and females with young to the grizzly bear population.**
85. **Group 3 addition: A separate fee should be added to black bear and grizzly bear hunting tags that would go directly to bear management and conservation. Model grizzly bear license fee application after moose, sheep, and goats.**

Education

86. ~~MTFWP should put more time and~~ **Investment should be made into conflict prevention and outreach focused on the safety of people working on the landscape raising livestock and crops.**
87. ~~Create volunteer education positions similar to hunter education~~ **Group 3: moved to 84 a**
88. **Develop** K-12 curriculum guides for teachers to implement grizzly education into learning objectives
 - a. ~~Cross-curriculum activities~~ **Group 3: Suggest deleting. Will be determined in process of creating curriculum**
 - b. Include the best available science, bear biology, and conflict prevention strategies. **Group 3: Edit should be created and implemented**
 - c. ~~Include games and activities that appeal to all learning styles.~~ **Group 3: Suggest deleting. Will be determined in process of creating curriculum**
 - d. **Group 3: Coordinate educational materials with tribal partners on the cultural significance of grizzly bears**
89. Expand and improve bear safety information to all outdoor user groups
 - a. Develop a recreating in bear country educational video
 - b. Encourage and educate about the use of bear spray
90. Create **Group 3: a comprehensive bear aware program with a lead** bear education coordinator position within FWP

Commented [17]: Moved and edited from conflict prevention. Fits better here.

Commented [18]: Group 3 suggests moving this under 84

Commented [19]: Discuss wording with Dale/Stacy and BFN

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

- a. Group 3: moved from 81. Create volunteer education positions similar to hunter education
 - b. Use the best available science, bear biology and conflict prevention strategies to streamline and create a catalog of all education, handouts, etc that exist 3
 - c. Group 3: Assist local communities in becoming bear aware. Bear-Wise Communities
 - d. Coordinate with tourism, realtors, VRBOs etc
 - e. Fund a FWP grizzly PR person to boost Group 3: Explore the need for better marketing around being bear aware. funding for conflict prevention and conservation.
 - f. Group 3: Work with agency partners to address outreach and education needs on public lands. with rapidly increasing use
 - g. Improve bear safety information and outreach to new residents and visitors.
91. A coexistence and education Summit Group 3: or Academy should take place regularly so that people can brainstorm and discuss new challenges and ways to address them
- a. group 3: take place regularly
 - b. create consistent messaging, reporting, and to share effective strategies
92. Group 3: Suggested edits. Partner with outdoor recreation companies to offer Mandatory bear awareness training for recreationists. on public and state lands. This could be encouraged by offering incentives like discounts at REI, Cabelas or bear spray etc
93. Hunter Education
- a. Create a video of bear safety lecture for hunters, anglers, hunters education classes, outfitters, residents and non-residents. Group 3: This lecture should include identification of males vs. female grizzly bears.
 - b. Require an annual online test for residents and non-residents on bear identification and couple this with a bear spray proper use video.
94. Require Group 3: Commercial foragers should watch a bear safety video and take a bear safety test each year with their licenses like hunters and anglers
95. Look into occupational safety and health safety standards for businesses (outfitters, state employees, recreational tours, etc.) for requiring bear safety standards

Commented [20]: Move under 84

Commented [21]: Is this Forest Service and is the word permits vs. license

Communication among agencies and between agencies and the public

96. Identify gaps in intergovernmental, interagency, and tribal coordination and create an action plan to address the gaps and improve the communication and coordination.
- Group 3: Moved from 92. Messaging should be consistent from agencies to the public and between agencies.
97. FWP needs to better Group 3: Improve communication between agencies and communicate with the public, especially with local communities landowners and livestock producers, when it comes to trapping and relocating grizzlies. for any reason.

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

98. ~~Establish consistent messaging~~ Group 3 moved this to 90
99. Work with relevant agencies to create a streamlined way for Group 3: deleted reliable - redundant reliable public reporting of possible grizzly bear sightings
100. Establish cooperative monitoring programs on public lands to assess impacts of increased recreation on grizzly bears wildlife into the future.
101. ~~Establish~~ Group 3 suggested edits: Support cooperative monitoring and conflict mitigation programs around grizzly bear livestock conflicts on public allotments and private land facilitated by local watershed groups or similar collaboratives. ~~FWP, USFS, Permittees, NGOs on public allotments~~ Group 3: a
102. The state should develop a bear aware/smart tourism and recreation plan. This should be coordinated with appropriate agencies. Group 3 suggested edit that celebrates grizzly bear recovery and addresses conflict zones. ~~Plan should address bear smart and appropriate recreation activities for core habitat and linkage zones.~~
103. Group 3: Suggested edit. Periodically review interagency MOUs for opportunities to improve efficiency and capacity for conflict response. ~~Should this be in conflict response or interagency communication?~~

Group 3: Additional Resources Needed:

WHY: (Do we need a section or list of where the funding should go? or should it be included in the pertinent section of the document.)

104. Increase partnership, funding and support for local watershed groups and other organizations to help (for example):
- Support local conflict mitigation efforts
 - expand outreach efforts
 - Provide salary cost shares with local groups Group 3 edit to not specify salary
105. ~~Support rural economies and private lands~~ Group 3 Suggested delete too broad
106. ~~Consider the implication de listing may have on future funding.~~ Group 3 suggest deleting
107. ~~Look for~~ Group 3 suggested edit: Secure long term and additional funding for the livestock loss board for compensation and conflict prevention.
108. ~~Separate compensation for depredation from funding for conflict response so each can be adequately funded.~~ Group 3 recommends deleting repeated in 57a
109. Support funding for conservation easements Group 3 in identified grizzly bear habitat.

IDEAS FOR GETTING FUNDING

110. Encourage state to pursue any and all options for increased funding opportunities ~~(federal, state and private funding sources)~~ Group 3: Edit
111. Wyoming Resolution and other tools Wyoming is using to fund wildlife management

Commented [22]: Group 3 Suggestions - is this better as an appendix in final document

Commented [23]: Group 3 This needs clarification

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

112. ~~Salary cost shares~~ Group 3: too broad would need clarification - do we get at this under our discussions of watershed group support
113. ~~Community Grants~~ Group 3: too broad
114. Establish a dedicated permanent fund including state and national partners for grizzly conservation. This permanent Grizzly Fund would pay for management and preventative measures for human and Group 3 edit: grizzly bear co-existence in the United States. Seed money from federal appropriations would start this fund
115. Group 3 addition: Look at increasing funding for and including grizzly bears in the federal Livestock Loss Demonstration grant program.
116. ~~Establish a permanent fund for non-lethal grizzly conservation that could be seeded with a farm bill appropriation and enhanced with national public contributions.~~
Group 3: This is repeated in 122
117. ~~Duck stamp model~~ Group 3: See #123
118. Resort/gas/tourism/recreation/bed tax and fees Group 3 added bed tax
119. AIS prevention pass model
120. ~~Montana recreation license~~ Group 3: Combine with #117
121. ~~Revive the Group 3:~~ Look into reviving the Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks past Living with Wildlife Grant Program
122. ~~Fees on building permits and real estate sales to preserve open spaces~~ Group 3: This will be a much harder sell than some other possibilities
123. Recreation license with low costs (1-2 dollars) for in-state and out-of-state recreationists (For example this exists for DNRC lands) Group 3 edit
124. Review CSKT and Blackfeet (\$10) conservation permits for ideas Group 3: Potentially combine with 117
125. Look at the Montana Sage Grouse Initiative and how funding comes through that specific to sage grouse habitat and conservation easements Group 3 addition
126. Conservation fee associated with national parks
127. Recovering America's Wildlife Act
128. Farm Bill NRCS
 - a. Support efforts to include in the next farm bill, funding for grizzly conservation/ conflict mitigation efforts.
129. Wildlife Conservation Stamp
130. Establish partnerships with insurance companies for wildlife friendly transportation infrastructure (for example - Colorado)
131. ~~Contribute to bear conflict management funding through a mandatory additional fee added to bear (black or grizzly) hunting license~~ Group 3 edit - repeat #79 added by Group 3 under hunting section

Other

132. Celebrate Grizzly Day
 - a. Encourage the Governor and the Legislature to designate a day to celebrate grizzly bear conservation, preferably in the spring when bears are waking up

Commented [24]: If we keep this we need more information

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

- ~~b. Bears as part of Montana's heritage to create awareness and remind folks that grizzlies are on the landscape.~~ Group 3: Suggested deletion. Unnecessary. Main point is dedication of a day

Topics that still need to be discussed as the council as a whole.

- Should we include Exec Order guiding principles in Preamble? See Group 3 suggestion above - yes we want to keep in preamble
- Use of "success" in preamble, needs careful understanding and definition Group 3 Did not see in Preamble
- what makes Montana unique in its conservation? Yes Group 3 edits see 3 and 4 in Preamble
- Importance of connecting "our" document to the Executive Order Group 3 feels this should be an appendix of our document and that it is clearly accessible to public
- How do the "whereas" statements from the executive order constrain or inform our work? Group 3 added #8 in the Preamble to get at what we thought was missing but recommend that the Council look over the Whereas before the May meeting to make sure we are covering them in our documents
- Where do we want bears and why? Group 3 has highlighted this as a Council discussion for May and we also included edits on some items that pertain to this and highlighted others (ex Areas) for further discussion

Subquestions - within recovery zones, between (connectivity zones), other areas? What is true recovery (metapopulation?) And where do we NOT want them?

- What is the continued role of recovery zones?

Group 3: Not sure if the Council needs to formally answer this question. Here are some thoughts

- Source population
 - Need to continue to monitor and count bears here into the future to determine health of the population
 - Recovery plans suited to bring up bear numbers but did not effectively cover long term management
- Is delisting part of the vision? Group 3 thoughts:
 - Group 3: Things that we recommend should support present and future health of the population so that healthy populations that meet requirements outlined by the FWS can be delisted.
 - Erin: Our recommendations should support bears and people where we are now and into the future regardless of where we are in the delisting process. If those populations remain healthy and secure that may in fact help move the needle towards delisting. I do not agree that delisting should be part of the vision as far as a direct goal (ex a statement-like This council recommends delisting of this population or that)
 - Group 3: We need to be aware as a council that recommendations that lead to action from an agency may positively or negatively influence delisting in the future.
 - Group 3: We do not want to detract from the continued recovery, conservation and management of grizzly bears by circling around a statement on delisting

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

- Is connectivity a part of our vision? Group 3: Yes part of our vision but there are many things to include or think about to support communities and address conflict in areas where connectivity is identified as important. Practically, bears do not know political boundaries so it can/will likely happen naturally. Concerns about conflicts as bears expand - Recommendations recognize impacts to people and should also work towards timely response, conflict prevention, minimization in conjunction with the idea of connectivity as part of our vision
- ~~-Do we want a meta-population in Montana, in lower 48?~~ Group 3 feels that a discussion around connectivity gets us to this
- What is our definition of socially acceptable / tolerant? Group 3: Not sure this is up for the council to define? Suggest a piece in the preamble that recognizes this variability of social tolerance and that our document works towards addressing issues that affect how people view and/or perceive grizzly bears. Social views are highly variable and dynamic. Recommend monitoring this over time and incorporate social science into overall monitoring and management. Involves values and peer response. Values are harder to shift but behaviors may shift in response to something.
- Definitions of "accounting for" and "consider" - what weight are we placing on the actions being discussed? Group 3 went through the document and changed words to something we agreed on but some of it will come to a larger group discussion
- Is the whole state "habitat"? Does "habitat" have to be occupied? Group 3: Not really - there are nuances here and there are places in the state where bears may not thrive and conflict potential is high.
- What does defined "habitat" mean for resource allocation? Group 3: occupied, expansion and connectivity habitat could be ways to prioritize limited resources
- ~~-What do we mean by whole state management, single population?~~ Group 3 discussion below on last bullet
- How do discuss different areas in the state - Group 2 as example Group 3 talks about this above multiple times. This is a larger group discussion for May
- Agreed upon definitions for terms Group 3 went through the document and changed words to something we agreed on but some of it will come to a larger group discussion
- use of create v. encourage v. require etc. Group 3 went through the document and changed words to something we agreed on but some of it will come to a larger group discussion
- Bear Aware, Bear Smart, Bear Wise terms? What does this mean or look like? Group 3: FWP should determine the best term but we were ok/liked with Bear Aware
- Loss compensation multiplier See Group 3 suggestion above - we included language we agreed on
- should we refrain from the use of the word governor since he will change... be more generic? Group 3: We don't really understand this one? Only comes up 3-4 times in the document now. "Governor" works for us
- What is the difference between one management plan and one habitat or population? Group 3: A statewide planning process is going to happen (Rich Harris was hired to conduct). Montana is not one population at this time but do see the need for a statewide plan

Working Group 4 – Draft Framework

Preamble

Frames context, need, and charge for the Council's work.

1. The grizzly bear is our state animal and important to Montana's heritage
2. ~~Most Montanans recognize that grizzly bears are an important part of what makes Montana the "Last Best Place" and~~ Do we need this here? What does the Council say? Group 4 says we are fine with leaving that out.
3. Montana is unique because we have the opportunity to create a connected grizzly bear population We think this is confusing. Maybe we could say Montana is unique in that it is in the position to facilitate a meta-population of grizzly bears. TRINA DOESN'T THINK WE NEED THIS.
4. Montana is unique in its conservation in the contiguous US. We could combine or use just 3 and strike #4.
5. Recognize the successful conservation strategies that have affected grizzly bears in Montana. conservation of bears.
6. Humans and bears have shared the landscape for thousands of years.
7. Recognize the work that has gone into that relationship and the continued effort towards coexistence with grizzly bears possibly add this to 5 or combine somehow
8. Recognize the diversity of cultural perceptions of grizzly bears (include tribal acknowledgement) Add also the effects on livelihoods of agriculture and tourism.
9. These are the guiding principles that guide the counsel recommendations.this could be the executive order in the addendum...please see.
 - a. Maintain and enhance human safety
 - b. Ensure a healthy and sustainable grizzly bear population
 - c. Improve timely and effective response to conflicts involving grizzly bears
 - d. Engage all partners in grizzly related outreach and conflict prevention
 - e. Improve intergovernmental, interagency, and tribal coordination

Vision

Articulates desired future state of Montana's relationship with the grizzly bear.(Should use FUTURE TENSE)

10. Recognize the value that grizzly bears bring to the state (tourism, wild nature, ecosystems) and also recognize the challenges that comes from living with bears on the landscape. (agriculture, tourism safety, general safety, property damage)
11. Montana has the opportunity to take the lead in conservation of endangered species like the grizzly bear.
12. Statement addressing where we want bears and Group 4 member wonders if we should make that decision. We need to let the bears go where they go and agencies can manage appropriately. (This leads to allowing for relocation areas outside recovery areas)

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

13. Populations of grizzly bears within the federally identified recovery zones are managed by Montana to prevent their reclassification as “threatened” or “endangered” under the ESA. Should vision and recommendations be more generic to either situation (listed or not)? **Group 4 says take out.**
14. Education, outreach and conflict response should be available in all areas where humans and grizzlies share the landscape **It is important for the whole state to have access to this info.**
15. Grizzly bear/human interactions should be understood from both biological and social science perspectives
16. Maintaining secure, remote areas where bears can roam away from populations is essential for the long-term conservation of bears.
17. We envision well-supported and well-funded management, research, and monitoring of grizzly bears. State and federal agencies should support and continue to implement research to promote the long-term conservation of grizzly bears and be at the forefront of providing the best available science.
18. Montana’s grizzly bear populations—Yellowstone, Northern Continental Divide, Cabinet-Yaak, Selkirks, and eventually the Bitterroot should be thriving, self-sustaining, and interconnected. **this could be less wordy if we promote the goal of a metapopulation. there is discussion of leaving out the named recovery areas. NOT SURE WE ALL AGREE ON THIS.**
19. We support cooperation and continued conservation efforts between state and federal agencies, the public, NGOs, tribal entities, grass roots organizations, **tourism industry, the agricultural community,** and local governments.
20. Facilitate natural movement among recovery zones, **this could be combined with 18 and the goal of a metapopulation. AGAIN, NOT SURE WE ALL AGREE**
21. We support decision making based on the best available science and current laws **Maybe “the law” instead of “current law” as it can change.**
22. Improve outreach and education
23. Establish new funding mechanisms for wildlife conservation and management in MT

Recommendations

Provides clear, discreet recommendations (and a way to capture input that doesn’t represent a consensus recommendation) based on the direction provided by the Executive Order topics, FWP questions, public input, existing research/publications, and Council discussion.

Grizzly Bear Distribution

24. MTFWP, in consultation with relevant agencies and the public, should develop a statewide management plan for grizzly bear conservation and management. The plan should address:
 - a. Biologically suitable and socially acceptable habitat **Bears are going to go where they go, maybe we should use the words suitable and acceptable habitat and leave the social idea out of there.**

- b. Biologically suitable has been defined in recovery zones, the whole state could possibly be “biologically suitable” **BIOLOGICALLY SUITABLE DOES NOT MEAN APPROPRIATE once again suitable and acceptable keep social out of mix**
 - c. Social tolerance is subjective **Strike through It is impossible to pin down**
 - d. **d,e,f,g,h,i can be combined with one simple sentence that incorporates all.** Connectivity should be accounted for in biologically suitable **habitat?** incorporates open space, connectivity and linkage zones
 - e. Incorporate assessment of human activities and impacts in conservation areas
 - f. Identify acceptable range and linkage zones
 - g. address unique challenges.
 - h. considers the entire state as a connected habitat
 - i. **AGAIN, SOMETHING ABOUT CONSIDERATION OF AGRICULTURE**
25. Grizzly bears should be managed to meet the recovery population goals within the existing recovery area **This is the law maybe not be necessary. WHAT ABOUT IN AREAS WHERE THEY'RE NOT SOCIALLY ACCEPTABLE?**
26. Provide opportunities to move between these areas in connectivity zones (Areas 1-3³) **we would like FWP and agencies to chime in on this idea of “areas” Do we think it is better to leave flexibility for managers without putting specifics out there?**
27. Encourage habitat restoration and enhancement on public and private lands
28. Allow natural movement including to new areas, **protect habitat**, protect local communities **HOW? goes back to metapopulation, education and conflict prevention.**
29. Create re-location/occupation areas in Montana
30. Grizzly bear populations should not be augmented by moving bears to previously unoccupied areas. **All areas in MT have been historically occupied. We disagree with this...Does this tie the hands of the agencies?**
31. **See number 26 for comments on this.** Group 2 worked to respond to the questions from FWP related to the critical topics identified by the Governor’s executive order. To conceptualize the ideas of distribution, we defined and discussed 4 zones of grizzly bear range and their associated management.
- a. Area 1 - Area surrounding Recovery Zones in the NCDE and GYE with strong populations
 - b. Area 2 - Area surrounding Recovery Zones in C-Y and Bitterroot Selway lacking strong populations
 - c. Area 3 - Connectivity zone between Areas 1-2 spanning a mix of private and public land
 - d. Area 4 - Lands outside of Areas 1-3 which do not provide connection to established Recovery Zones

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

32. 26, 31 and 32 all deal with the “areas” discussion needed. Bears should be managed within and between the four designated recovery ecosystems within Montana. Manage for habitat and population growth in Area 1, manage for conflict prevention and sustained populations in Areas 1-3, manage for conflict prevention and response in Area 4
33. Plan should include a detailed and comprehensive outreach and education component to address social tolerance and acceptance¹ take social out
34. Review and update the 1993 recovery plan (not sure if this belongs or not) this must be in our recommendations because it is way too old and does need to be updated
35. This is definitely a discussion, it might not be prudent to use the term connectivity zones. But we must keep the recovery areas legally. We see this as one plan with different methods in the different recovery areas depending on needs : The recovery areas (this cannot be done by us) and outside zones of each ecosystem should be removed and Montana should be designated as one grizzly bear habitat keeping in mind that biologically suitable does not mean socially acceptable or appropriate. (this is a council conversation) (We need to discuss the difference between one management plan and one population) One plan for all of MT with different subsets/ zones / recovery areas within the plan for different populations.
36. Management protocols should include flexibility
37. Encourage maybe “support” is a better word here. This is a conversation with council. What do the different terms mean? habitat restoration and enhancement on public and private lands
38. Encourage and leave out encourage support research and monitoring around food resources, habitat, road densities and other identified research needs related to habitat security, in areas of current and future grizzly bear occupancy.

Connectivity

39. Connectivity is vital to the long term sustainability, persistence, and resiliency of grizzly bears in the lower 48. (Montana has the opportunity to take the lead in conservation of the grizzly bear.) this is the idea of Meta-population can that simply be the goal?
 - a. Strive for occupied habitat between recovery zones
 - b. Protect habitat to allow for natural movement? migration
 - i. Conservation easements
 - ii. No hunting of grizzly bears allowed in connectivity zones I DON'T AGREE WITH THIS ONE We are not reaching consensus.
 - iii. Evaluate federal land use planning processes and projects for impact to habitat requirements for natural connectivity with focus on human safety, food storage and road management
 - iv. Bears in connectivity zones will not be translocated back to recovery areas (need to develop areas in DMA outside PCA that are tolerable relocation zones) discussed before

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

- v. Restrict new residential development to allow for wildlife movement near public lands. **I ABSOLUTELY DON'T AGREE WITH LIMITING PRIVATE LANDOWNERS.** Clustering with wildlife corridor. Attractant restrictions **Must be some sort of local ordinance... could we support local govts to address this?**
- 40. The likely connectivity zones exist in diverse social and environmental settings - not all of these settings are conducive to permanent habitation, but should be managed to promote genetic connectivity **WHILE MAKING HUMAN SAFETY THE NUMBER ONE PRIORITY. More repetition... flexibility, guiding principles say this**
- 41. FWP define connectivity zones within Montana where natural/functional connectivity (i.e. occupancy, ecological function in connective areas) is proactively encouraged through:
 - i. Management decisions take connectivity into consideration
 - ii. **This one is not a repetition and should be part:** Increase monitoring of bear movements between recovery zone users to reduce conflicts spatially/temporally real-time and improve communication between locals and agencies
 - iii. Need to develop relocation areas in between recovery zones
 - iv. Improve communication and work with local communities, **farmers and ranchers**, to discuss tolerable relocation areas.
- 42. Work with MDT and Federal Highways and Trains **maybe railroads instead of trains** to reduce transportation mortalities and facilitate movement and enhance public safety
 - i. Enhance understanding of priority areas; include wildlife migration (**strike "migration"**) corridors into infrastructure improvement plans 2
 - ii. Identify, model and develop potentially important grizzly bear crossing points on major highways and seek funding and planning opportunities to incorporate wildlife crossing practices into the transportation system
 - ~~iii.~~ Protecting and identifying these areas will provide more areas of colonization to relocate bears and encourage natural ~~migration~~ movement and connectivity between recovery areas. Private lands in between tareas should be considered for conservation easements. **Any easement would have to be negotiated between private landowner and the entity creating the crossing.**
 - iv. **suggested reduced speed limits in known crossing areas (we don't have agreement on this.**
 - b. Work with partners on **strike up to here and just say Support** a wildlife transportation safety campaign
 - c. Work with appropriate entities to explore ways to minimize train/bear collisions due to grain spills and carcasses near train tracks.
 - 1. Think tanks for solving problems in high mortality situations
 - 2. Suggested reduced speed limits at night **moved to iv above meant for cars**

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

- d. Private lands and identified areas should be included in the conversation and considered for conservation easements **discussed before landowner must agree to an easement. WHAT ABOUT PRIVATE LANDOWNERS THAT DON'T WANT TO BE CONTROLLED BY AN EASEMENT?**

- i. Protect habitat in connectivity zones **(discussion is needed on these)**
 - 1. Road building restrictions similar to Amendment 19
 - 2. Recommend Wilderness designation for WSAs
 - 3. Honor strict protections of IRAs

Moving Bears group 4 says this is the connectivity and relocation conversation.

- 43. All agencies should work together to develop a protocol for translocating bears a) between ecosystems, b) within an ecosystem, c) outside of a designated ecosystem, which further the conservation, connection and recovery of grizzly bears in the state of Montana. Bears translocated due to previous conflict may need to be placed deeper into core habitat of a designated ecosystem.
- 44. Previous agreements regarding augmentation and transplanting in recovery zones should continue to be honored
- 45. USFWS, FWP USFS and WS need to work together with local landowners, local watershed groups and county governments to identify new relocation sites outside of the designated management areas, especially in connectivity zones.
- 46. Human assisted movement of bears may be a strategy when needed, for example, to rescue a subpopulation. **NO. EARLIER WE SAID WE WANT BEARS TO MOVE ON THEIR OWN. WE SHOULD REMOVE 46 AND 47. This is a tool for agencies to use, does it need to be a recommendation?**
- 47. Male bears should be relocated to new areas to promote genetic dispersal (does the one above say the same thing as this?)
- 48. Bears should not be moved back to the population they came from. They should be moved to predesignated sites within Areas 1 and 2 or public land anchors of Area 3 with priority to areas that have not met recovery goals **REMOVE**
- 49. Agencies should use habitat research to establish suitable relocation sites in Montana. **YES**
- 50. If bears are already in or near unoccupied areas, allow for flexibility and allow moving bears to the nearest remote habitat rather than returned to recovery areas (are these getting at the same message of the need to identify relocation areas in between zones? Iso, can these be combined?) **Combine 49 and 50, take out 48, AGREE**
- 51. **flexibility is there already do we need this?** Decisions related to food conditioned, habituated, or known conflict bears should be given extra consideration and more flexible management opportunities **IF THEY'RE NOT A THREAT TO HUMAN OR LIVESTOCK.**
- 52. **This might be in the communication section: Yes we should point out the difference in augment vs relocate:** Clarification is needed when communicating with the public about Transplant Protocols and the difference between re-locating a bear that moved in on its

own vs. reintroduction/augmentation **WE DON'T NEED THIS ONE IF WE'RE SAYING BEARS CAN'T BE MOVED BY PEOPLE.**

Conflict Prevention

53. Continue to **just use support!** support, fund and encourage carcass removal programs.
54. Create consistent food storage requirements across state and federal lands and encourage **use support here** the same standards on private lands.
 - a. reach out to outfitters - MT Board of Outfitters¹
55. Land managers provide bear resistant/conflict reducing infrastructure in areas of potential conflict on public lands
56. There should be a prioritization of conflict prevention regulations that help to prevent conflict within and nearby Areas (see explanation of areas by group 2)
 - a. Statewide regulations for public land use **WHAT DOES THIS MEAN?**
 - b. Sanitation/waste recommendations for municipalities/private land
 - c. On public lands, phase in regulations with opportunity for public response and “buy in”
 - d. **this is repeated in ed and outreach and communication.** Recommendation that state encourages federal agencies to consolidate bear related information, outreach, and regulations within Montana
 - i. Multi-agency cooperation and consistency
57. Human prevention **this needs to be reworded**
 - a. Create an additional conflict prevention grant program, not coupled with the Livestock Loss Board, to address conflicts and losses.
 - b. **this is repeated in resources.** One idea would be to reassess the Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks Living with Wildlife grant program.
 - c. Work with planning boards to proactively recommend actions to governing bodies on how to minimize bear conflicts
 - d. Public (hunters recreationists, anglers, hikers etc)
 1. Foraging and recreation should be seasonally limited in areas with high grizzly concentrations. Trails and other public areas should be subject to closures when necessary
 - e. Farms and Ranches
 1. MTFWP should put more time and resources into conflict prevention, and should focus on the safety of those people that must work on the landscape raising livestock and crops.
 2. Encourage a consistent messaging system between bear managers, residents and livestock producers. This would also encourage neighborhood watch systems
 3. Encourage livestock conflict prevention measures
 4. **Add in crop loss reimbursement at least until areas can be considered crop insurance programs.**

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

- f. Reduce public and state land conflicts
 - 1. Encourage carrying accessible bear spray in bear country
 - 2. **There should be a system for deciding whether new trails in core are appropriate.** New trails should not be constructed in core grizzly habitat
 - 3. Front country campgrounds, picnic areas, and other areas utilized for vehicle or bicycle camping should have bear resistant food and attractant storage facilities. Bear resistant infrastructure should be available at all federal and local campgrounds and other public areas. **how about just sentence 2**
 - 4. Encourage **use support** livestock producers to implement appropriate conflict prevention on public lands
- g. Reduce Hunter Conflicts
 - 1. Increase education of hunting safely in bear country
 - 2. Encourage **use support here and below** outfitters to provide bear spray and training to clients
 - 3. Encourage **use support** carrying bear spray when hunting
- h. Montana needs to invest in more outreach in all zones across the state.
 - 1. **Repeated in many places.** Recommend that outreach is enhanced and that FWP look to prioritize conflict response when creating / funding new positions. Look to cost-share models that currently exist (e.g. Eric Graham, Blackfoot Challenge).
 - 2. Recommend that FWP prioritize cost share/ liaison positions over direct hires in Areas 3 and 4 **we need to talk about 3 and 4 we need the best qualified people.**
- i. Continue to support and fully fund necessary bear conservation management personnel so they can continue the outreach and education programs; deal effectively, efficiently and quickly with conflict issues wherever they occur
- j. **Bear aware makes the most sense, great framework, already in progress. we could make suggested. changes. It might be worthwhile to look at it and offer changes if warranted.** Establish bear wise community guidelines and protocols. Include an incentive program that encourages Montana communities within bear country to become Bear Wise communities
- k. Encourage governor and Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks to develop a state Bear Aware outreach and education program with a designated bear aware outreach supervisor with the goal to reach all Montanans, tourists, visitors and everyone who enjoys the outdoors, recreates, works and uses the outdoors. Standardize bear spray requirements and protocols to allow everyone to carry bear spray in bear country. (e.g. FedEx, UPS drivers;)
- l. Waste management/sanitation
 - 1. Support the development of local sanitation ordinances that include enforcement.
 - 2. **use support instead of encourage in all of these.** Encourage consistency with sanitation recommendations.
 - 3. Encourage county and local governments to work with local haulers to assess the need to create a bear resistant disposal option and encourage

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

- carriers to modify practices to mitigate bear conflicts. Governor and Federal agencies should pursue funding to support this effort
4. **support again.** Encourage municipal **ordinances instead of storage orders** storage orders
 - a. Bear resistant garbage containers
 - b. Waste transfer stations
 - m. Support existing carcass removal programs in areas of grizzly bear populations, and implement in areas where necessary and not currently in place
 - n. **This is another bear aware question.** Improve communication and messaging with MT visitors and office of tourism
 1. Governor should encourage local communities to embrace bear-wise practices by supporting local grass roots and watershed community groups to work together on becoming bear-wise communities. This should originate in local communities, but state and federal governments can encourage through funding and other support.
 - o. **These can be combined in organization;** Reduce residential conflicts
 - i. Review FWP subdivision recommendations
 - ii. Create attractant restrictions
 - iii. **Encourage all communities to be Bear Aware**
 - iv. Encourage neighborhood communication networks

Conflict Response and Protocols

58. Standardize and clarify management protocols for severe conflict bears (problem bears) and fully fund this part of the conflict prevention program. Continue to use established protocols for bears that continue to engage in severe conflict situations such as food adaptation, unnatural aggressive behavior.... (find legal language)¹
59. More conservative response in Area 1 (**EXCEPT WHEN DEALING WITH BEARS PREYING ON LIVESTOCK**) and 2 than Area 3 and 4
60. More liberal/flexible management in Areas 3 and 4 to build trust and acceptance within these communities
61. More liberal/flexible management within private lands in Areas 1 and 2 than on public lands in these areas . **We need to discuss the areas and if we want to use them. If we choose not to use these areas 59, 60, 61 are covered in 58 and 63.**
62. **State management protocols should be similar state-wide with flexibility case by case, current protocols currently allow for this**
 - a. **Current protocols allow for instant removal in certain cases**
 - b. **Decisions should prioritize human safety, livelihoods, and common sense.**
 - c. **Current protocols allow enough flexibility to adapt to changes in distribution**<https://umontana.zoom.us/j/98646735143>**We agree with strike out here**

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

63. Establish clear guidelines for lethal removal of grizzly bears that are consistent with federal regulations and allow for flexibility. The guidelines should be driven by: 1) geography; 2) demographics; 3) evidence of livestock rovic livdepredation; and 4) conflict severity. Do these last two numbered items say the same thing? Is this one more comprehensive? Agree to using 63 but add human safety to this list. We think that maybe chronic should be taken out to allow more flexibility for wildlife management specialists.

64. Provide an adequate number of year-round bear management specialists and technicians:

- a. Sufficient, year-round and reliable funding would better allow for transfer of expertise from bear-managers to bear managers in training
- b. Improve response time
- c. Allow time for relationship building, outreach, and communication with landowners and livestock producers (for example in linkage zones ahead of bear distribution)

65. Allow landowners to use effective non-lethal methods to haze habituated bears away (For example bear spray cannons that can be used at a distance).

- a. Research effective methods to deter and haze bears for public and bear managers
- b. Educate landowners on safety and use of allowable non-lethal methods to haze bears.

A multiplier is a topic of consideration because...(why a multiplier) meeting discussion April 24

66. Research and explore the possible implementation of a multiplier for livestock loss due to grizzly depredation. Multiplier should have limits pertaining to type of operation, geography, participation in conflict prevention, and personal responsibility. Maybe use the term best management practices instead of "conflict prevention."

Role of Hunting We have not reached consensus on this.

67. Hunting should be considered as a management tool using the best available science to determine limited quota hunts. we do not have consensus

68. Given complete recovery and monitoring for sustainable populations in each of the 4 recovery ecosystems consideration should be given to Areas 1 and 4

69. There will be no hunting of any grizzly bear population until endangered species protections are removed

70. Any grizzly bear hunt should be managed by MTFWP to ensure and maintain a healthy grizzly bear population. no consensus on hunting

71. Messaging to the public should establish that hunting will not replace the need for conflict prevention,

72. Slow/Delayed rollout of hunting after delisting.

73. Consideration of geographic area/importance to connectivity.

74. FWP implements depredation hunts when necessary.

75. Strict enforcement of poaching is necessary for the long-term conservation of bears and stringent fines and enforcement should continue regardless of listing. Consider increasing poaching fines. We have consensus

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Strikethrough

Commented [25]: I DON'T AGREE WITH THE LAST SENTENCE. SOME OF US CAN'T USE THE PREVENTION METHODS THEY RECOMMEND - DOESN'T MEAN WE'RE NOT BEING VIGILANT.

Commented [26]: I DON'T UNDERSTAND THIS ONE.

Commented [27]: PROBABLY DON'T NEED THIS ONE BECAUSE IT ALREADY ISN'T ALLOWED UNDER THE ESA.

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

76. If a hunt is allowed, it should be delayed for a few years after de-listing, should be extremely limited in scope, should not allow hunting near the parks, should not allow hunting in vital linkage habitat, and should be easily suspended or cancelled during high mortality years.
77. USFWS, MTFWP and USDA Wildlife Services, Tribal agencies, should work together to use their expertise, best available science, and experience to establish a hunting season or seasons in Montana that will both maintain and help control the population. We would add the stipulation that this would not happen till after de-listing.

Commented [28]: I DON'T AGREE WITH THIS.

Education

78. Create volunteer education positions similar to hunter education We think this could be removed. Volunteers are hard to find and difficult to manage.
79. Develop K-12 curriculum guides for teachers to implement grizzly education into learning objectives
- Cross-curriculum activities
 - Include the best available science, bear biology, and conflict prevention strategies should be created and implemented
 - Include games and activities that appeal to all learning styles.
80. Expand and improve bear safety information to all outdoor user groups
- Develop a recreating in bear country educational video We could use the Living with Bears Video
 - Encourage and educate about the use of bear spray
81. Create a bear education coordinator position within FWP
- Use the best available science, bear biology and conflict prevention strategies to streamline and create a catalog of all education, handouts, etc that exist 3
 - Bear-Wise Communities Bear Aware
 - Coordinate with tourism, realtors, VRBOs etc
 - Fund a FWP grizzly PR person to boost funding for conflict prevention and conservation. We disagree on this one. Can we make sure that the management specialists are adequately funded first.
 - Address outreach and education needs on public lands with rapidly increasing use
 - improve bear safety information and outreach to new residents and visitors.
82. A coexistence and education Summit or Academy should take place regularly so that people can brainstorm and discuss new challenges and ways to address them
- create consistent messaging, reporting, and to share effective strategies
83. Mandatory Not sure how this could be mandatory. bear awareness training for recreationists on public and state lands. This could be encouraged by offering incentives like discounts at REI, Cabelas or bear spray etc
84. Hunter Education

Commented [29]: THESE PEOPLE NEED TO BE EXTREMELY VETTED TO MAKE SURE THEY'RE DELIVERING A CONSISTENT, TRUTHFUL MESSAGE.

Commented [30]: I'D RATHER THE FUNDS GO TOWARD ACTUAL MANAGEMENT. THEY HAVE PLENTY OF PR PEOPLE.

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

- a. Create a video of bear safety lecture for hunters, anglers, hunters education classes, outfitters, residents and non-residents **There is a video already living with bears**
 - b. Require **Chad does not like a yearly test we could get behind every 5 years, but non-residents should do it every year.** an annual online test for residents and non-residents on bear identification and couple this with a bear spray proper use video
85. Require commercial foragers watch a bear safety video and take a bear safety test each year with their licenses like hunters and anglers **Commercial foragers hire workers that need to be educated as well... how can we get info to these temp workers. We might need a multi-lingual video.**
86. Look into occupational safety and health safety standards for businesses (outfitters, state employees, recreational tours, etc.) for requiring bear safety standards **Not sure what this means. Are we talking about adding standards that address bear safety? Are we talking about OSHA or state requirements.**

Communication among agencies and between agencies and the public

- 87. Identify gaps in intergovernmental, interagency, and tribal coordination and create an action plan to address the gaps and improve the communication and coordination.
- 88. FWP needs to better communicate with the public, especially with landowners and livestock producers, when it comes to trapping and relocating grizzlies for any reason.
- 89. Establish consistent messaging
- 90. Work with relevant agencies to create a streamlined way for reliable public reporting of possible grizzly bear sightings
- 91. Establish cooperative monitoring programs on public lands to assess impacts of increased recreation on wildlife into the future.
- 92. Establish cooperative monitoring programs – FWP, USFS, Permittees, NGOs on public allotments
- 93. The state should develop a **bear aware/smart tourism** and recreation plan that celebrates grizzly bear recovery and addresses conflict zones. Plan should address bear smart and appropriate recreation activities for core habitat and linkage zones. **We need consistent verbiage with bear aware. Should this be in conflict prevention?**
- 94. Review interagency MOUs for opportunities to improve efficiency and capacity for conflict response **Should this be in conflict response or interagency communication?**

Resources:

This is a full council discussion because there are limits as to where funds can be spent. Each section should have a request for funding or funding needs associated with it.

WHY: (Do we need a section or list of where the funding should go? or should it be included in the pertinent section of the document.)
this should be in the pertinent section. Fund such and such in the pertinent section.

Commented [31]: AGAIN, NEEDS TO BE CONSISTENT WITH BEAR AWARE THROUGHOUT THE DOCUMENT.

Commented [32]: I THINK WE SHOULD ASSIGN THESE FUNDING COMMENTS TO THE AREAS THAT WE WANT FUNDED - UNDER THE APPROPRIATE HEADINGS. CONFLICT PREVENTION, FOR INSTANCE, COULD INCLUDE HOW WE SUGGEST ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES.

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

95. Increase partnership, funding and support for local watershed groups and other organizations to help (for example):
 - a. Support local conflict mitigation efforts
 - b. expand outreach efforts
 - c. Provide salary cost shares with local groups
96. Support rural economies and private lands
97. Consider the implication de-listing may have on future funding.
98. Look for long term funding for the livestock loss board
99. Separate compensation for depredation from funding for conflict response so each can be adequately funded.
100. Support funding for conservation easements

IDEAS FOR GETTING FUNDING

101. Encourage state to pursue any and all options for increased funding opportunities (federal, state and private funding sources)

Consider a tax similar to Pittman Robertson on recreation equipment to go towards conservation fund. Can we direct it to not add to hunters and anglers. Can we make it specific to users other than hunter and anglers.

102. Wyoming Resolution and other tools Wyoming is using to fund wildlife management
103. Salary cost shares
104. Community Grants
105. Establish a dedicated permanent fund including state and national partners for grizzly conservation. This permanent Grizzly Fund would pay for management and preventative measures for human and bear co-existence in the United States. Seed money from federal appropriations would start this fund.
106. Establish a permanent fund for non-lethal grizzly conservation that could be seeded with a farm bill appropriation and enhanced with national public contributions. 107 and 108 could be combined. There is a lack of consensus on separating lethal and non-lethal funding.
107. Duck stamp model can be combined with Wildlife Conservation Stamp.
108. Resort/gas/tourism/recreation tax and fees Could combine park fee here
109. AIS prevention pass model What is this?
110. Montana recreation license INSTEAD: all recreationists should be required to purchase a conservation license this would not add to hunter angler fees and it is already created.
111. Revive the Living with Wildlife Grant Program
112. Fees on building permits and real estate sales to preserve open spaces Problem with this is private property rights and many fees on these are already in place.

Commented [33]: TAKE NON-LETHAL OUT AND I'M ALL FOR IT.

WORKING GROUP DRAFT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

113. Recreation license with low costs (1-2 dollars) for in-state recreationists (For example this exists for DNRC lands) *This could be combined with 112 ... all required to purchase conservation licenses already in place.*
114. Review CSKT and Blackfeet conservation permits for ideas *This could be combined with 112 as well... require Conservation License for all recreationists.*
115. Look at the Montana Sage Grouse Initiative and how funding comes through that specific to sage grouse habitat
116. Conservation fee associated with national parks. *Add a dollar or two fee to enter Glacier, Yellowstone to large carnivore fund.*
117. Recovering America's Wildlife Act
118. Farm Bill NRCS
 - a. Support efforts to include in the next farm bill, funding for grizzly conservation/ conflict mitigation efforts. *Should we take out conservation... members of group 4 do not think it should come from the Farm Bill.*
119. **Wildlife Conservation Stamp** *this can be combined with duck stamp*
120. Establish partnerships with insurance companies for funding wildlife friendly transportation infrastructure (for example - Colorado)
121. Contribute to bear **conflict management** funding through a mandatory additional fee added to bear (black or grizzly) hunting license *Group members think too much to add to hunters should not be considered.*

Commented [34]: THIS NEEDS TO BE COMBINED WITH 107.

Commented [35]: NO.

Other

122. Celebrate Grizzly Day
 - a. Encourage the Governor and the Legislature to designate a day to celebrate grizzly bear conservation, preferably in the spring when bears are waking up
 - b. Bears as part of Montana's heritage to create awareness and remind folks that grizzlies are on the landscape.

Topics that still need to be discussed as the council as a whole.

1 Where do we want bears and why? *Bears will go where they go... not much can be done other than conflict prevention, education and management.*

Subquestions - within recovery zones, between (connectivity zones), other areas? What is true recovery (metapopulation?)

What is the continued role of recovery zones?

-Is delisting part of the vision?

-Is connectivity a part of our vision?

-Do we want a meta-population in Montana, in lower 48?

What do we mean by whole state management, single population?

What is the difference between one management plan and one habitat or population?

What do we mean by managing all the bears in the state as one population?

2 What is our definition of socially acceptable / tolerant? *socially needs to just be taken out of this. Too subjective.*

3 DISCUSS WHAT WE REALLY AGREE UPON RESOURCES

-Use of "success" in preamble, needs careful understanding and definition

Bear Aware: Easy agree and choose a subcommittee to look for more suggestions with maybe Sarah and Dillon?

-Bear Aware, Bear Smart, Bear Wise terms? What does this mean or look like?

-Should we include Exec Order guiding principles in Preamble? Thoughts that this is not necessary in the preamble. Wasting page space by adding something that is a given.

-Importance of connecting "our" document to the Executive Order

-How do the "whereas" statements from the executive order constrain or inform our work? Possibly include exec order as an appendix to save space in final document.

-what makes Montana unique in its conservation?

-Definitions of "accounting for" and "consider" - what weight are we placing on the actions being discussed?

use of create v. encourage v. require etc.

We thought support might be the best term for many since it includes funding and consideration and encouragement.

If it is a recommendation we think it is important, so strong wording. "consider" is not very strong. maybe a stronger word.

-Is the whole state "habitat"? Does "habitat" have to be occupied? Tie this to the recommendation on one habitat. Montana is all bear country. This is reference to Bear Aware and Safety

-What does defined "habitat" mean for resource allocation?

We recommend prioritizing resources as needed.

-How do discuss different areas in state - Group 2 as example

We would like to hear more about these designations and is this something we should really be doing or should agencies make this decision.

-Agreed upon definitions for terms Use definitions already in place.

-Loss compensation multiplier We wrote our ideas into recommendation text

should we refrain from the use of the word governor since he will change... be more generic?

Administration? State? Agencies